

THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1871.

---

ART. I.—ORGANIC REDEMPTION.

---

BY SAMUEL H. GIESY, D. D., BALTIMORE, MD.

---

THIRD ARTICLE.

*Organic Christianity—The Church.*

IN the discussion of the above subject, we have come thus far: The ruin of humanity generically and actually brought to pass in the fall of the first Adam; its redemption alike generically and actually accomplished in Christ, the second Adam; separately treated in two articles in the July and October (1870) numbers of this Review.

This redemption, seen to be as broad as the race in Christ, the concrete unification of earth's diverse peoples, cannot, however, be taken by itself alone as the entire process. The world's redemption, though fully actualized in Him, is not, *ipso facto*, the whole world's salvation; the two words in reality designating complementary and answering sides of the one great scheme of grace. The actual result, conditioned on the free appropriating act of man, the needy receiver, is seen, in fact, to fall far below the breadth and comprehension of the provision of God, the Giver; the limitation, however, proceeding from the human, not from the Divine, factor.

The leading question in this inquiry, challenging earnest and honest thought, is, How shall we be conjoined with a redemption, divinely taking in the whole compass of humanity? How apprehend or lay hold on that by which we have first been apprehended or laid hold on by Christ Jesus? Ruled by the self-evolving necessity of the organic view already presented, the question can find, of course, its complete and only right answer in the actual presence in the world still of the great redemption under an objective form, its concrete historical reality, in which our Lord's latest promise, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," is seen to come to its perpetual fulfillment, and in which, according to that same Divine word, it is alone possible for that grace sacramentally to reach us.

We brought the previous article to a close with this anticipative thought: He who has little or no faith in the Church, henceforward the organ and historical continuity of the grace brought into the world in the Incarnate Mystery, has, in fact, just as little faith really in Christ Himself; forecasting thus the necessity of a mystical union with Him, holding in a Body Mystical, of which He is the ever-living Head. The wholeness of the subject, it is thus easily seen, requires a complemental thought, even as, in the grand movement of grace itself, historically considered, we shall find a third and completing factor, an essential part of Christianity, constituted, through the Holy Ghost, the form and medium of the actual presence of the New Creation in Christ, onward to the consummation of all things.

Organic ruin, we found, carried along with it this absolute postulate: a redemption of a like organic character and comprehension. Religion, from *re* and *ligo*, to bind anew, is the rebinding of God and man; this, however, in no outward and mechanical way, as a tempest-tossed vessel, grappled by hooks of steel, is made fast to its solid anchorage, but by an inward, substantial oneness of both natures, the One redeeming, and the one needing redemption; an actual interpenetration of life, as a graft, growing wildly apart, is taken and incorporated into a better stock. This union was, we have already seen, a personal reality in Christ, the concrete God-man. In Him, God

and man, heaven and earth, standing apart by the sad results of the fall, are brought again together in the unity of a common life, thus making room for the restoration to God of the generations of mankind, as they succeed one another on the earth.

By the wonderful constitution of His person, standing in the bosom, and at the very centre of humanity, and yet essentially greater than humanity, under its widest form, there was in Christ the introduction of a higher order of life, not in the constitution of the world before, as such, and which, of course, it had no power whatever to originate. Broadly and repeatedly His coming in the flesh is proclaimed to be a new order of things entirely. Bold as the thought is, St. Paul shrinks not from characterizing this re-heading of humanity a NEW CREATION, *καινή κτίσις* (2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15), "the real beginning of a spiritual constitution, of a character totally different from nature."

Here, indeed, the creative Word is not, as in the old creation, an extrinsic force, the mere fiat of Omnipotence, a power beyond and apart from His work, but seeks and makes an inward lodgment in the very depths of the nature thus re-created; the Divine, with this fresh "Beginning of the creation of God" (*ἡ Ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ*, Rev. iii. 14), actually entering into the living line of our fallen humanity, not transiently, but permanently, and running parallel with its own ill-fortunes, only to surmount them all in the end, in His own glorious triumph over sin, and death, and Satan. Hence, He is the Redeemer, in no mere *ex-officio* way, *i. e.*, One standing apart from the race, clothed, by virtue alone, of official appointment and work, with redeeming powers, and only operating with individuals separately, coming to Him, one by one—the "causal source" of redemption, using Dr. Hodge's term; but incorporating fallen humanity into Himself, He is the redemption itself, its living Principle and Root, and not merely the centre of redeeming powers as such.\* "In Him," St. John vigorously

---

\* "Christ does not simply order and prescribe the process of redemption, but accomplishes the whole work in Himself; so that it is not merely *by* Him, but *in* Him, that it is made to reach the world, under the most perfect and all-sufficient form;

affirms, "was life," not simply causatively, but *fontally*, and so directly adds, "and the Life was the light of men" (St. John i. 4). And it follows, accordingly, only as we are *in* Him have we *life*, and consequently, *light*.

But how now shall we stand in Him? stand in Him, not as the scholar in his master, nor the disciple in the philosopher, by the mere acceptance of His doctrine; but as the members of the body stand in the head and are one with its life; as the branches stand in the vine and are one with it; as we are one with the original progenitor of the race, and stand in his life; real partakers of the nature of the second Adam (2 Peter i. 4); branches of the True Vine (St. John xv. 5)?

The ground fact of the Religion of Redemption, giving us the distinctive character of Christianity, will alone furnish us with the true answer to the above question. Entering the world in Christ as a new order of life for our sin and death-stricken

---

since He stood in full union with God, and was free from all sin. . . . The religion which He brought into the world, was not merely given by Him; it was *in* Him, and remains *in* Him still, as its living fountain; He is, *Himself*, its grand constituent, as being the perfect, everlasting Redeemer, and as such the One without a fellow, over against whom all others stand as subjects for redemption." Dr. C. Ullmann's article on "The Distinctive Character of Christianity," translated from the German by Dr. Nevin, and forming the Preliminary Essay of his work: "The Mystical Presence," p. 25. And so Dr. Nevin, himself, in keeping here with his own full and broad endorsement of Ullmann: "Christ does not exhibit Himself accordingly, as the medium only, by which the truth is brought nigh to men. He claims always to be Himself, all that the idea of salvation claims. He does not simply point men to heaven. He does not merely profess to give right instruction. He does not present to them only the promise of life, as secure to them from God on certain conditions. But He says, 'I AM the WAY, and the TRUTH, and the LIFE; no man cometh unto the Father but by ME.' . . . "Christ is the substance, and not merely the source, of this salvation. So completely, indeed, is this view interwoven with the whole style of thinking in the New Testament, that we often fail, for this very reason, to notice the extent to which it is carried." *Mystical Presence*, pp. 215, 219. Again, "The salvation of the world stood, first of all, in His own person. It was there as a real outward constitution, an act of self-revelation on the part of God, set over against the order of nature, the presence of a higher economy brought down into the midst of it from above, and making room within its bosom for all the grace that is comprehended in the idea of the Gospel. 'In Him was life; and the life became the light of men.' He was Himself the way to the Father, the absolute Truth, the Resurrection and the Life. It is in this deep sense, originally, that the Gospel is represented to be 'A NEW CREATION.'"—Review of Hodge on Ephesians, *Mercersburg Review*, 1857, p. 209.



race, it is not, essentially and primarily, the religion of doctrinal apprehension. Doctrine being alone for the understanding gives us, of necessity, a religion first passing through the crucial test of the human reason, something to be measured and grasped by it; communicated, as science, philosophy, or other learning, through the medium purely of the intellect. Over against this mere doctrinal theory of Christianity, it is a sufficient offset, that Christ Himself penned not a single line, neither made any provision for the preservation of His teachings in a written form, nor established a school of His own, speculative or theological. He did not present Himself as a philosopher. He gave, external to Himself, no formal system of religious instruction. Neither the Gospels, nor Epistles contain any systematic teaching. He was Himself the absolute Personal Truth, according to His own emphatic claim, *I AM the Truth* (St. John xiv. 6). "Doctrine," says Dr. Ullmann, "gives us Christianity in an outward way; but the life of Christ *is* Christianity. It must, indeed, be formed into doctrine for the purposes of popular and scientific instruction; but in its own nature, it still remains life, living power, a revelation of the Spirit in the form of facts." A life then with which our dead race is, in some way, to be conjoined, and not a body of divinity to be studied and learned, as a school-boy his task, or an enthusiastic disciple some system of philosophy, it reaches us primarily, not by any mental process, but sacramental agency.

Nor is it essentially the religion of ethical rule. Ethics being for the will, would give us a religion of outward deportment simply, conformity to a code of morals, a rule of conduct. To find its specific character mainly in its ethical force, is to make it the support merely of morality, a means only for an end beyond itself, instead of being, like the fruit of a tree, the self-manifesting, self-authenticating principle of all godly living. In this view, the iron rule of duty is everything, making little or no account of the soul of duty, a heart, in love poised and centred in the divine will, fulfilling of its own sweet accord the whole law; "not a requisition in God's name, but a divine gift that of itself, when planted in the heart, impels it without

commandment, to the most free morality." Embracing and realizing both these in Christ, the Life of life, Christianity is pre-eminently a *life*, in its deepest sense and inmost nature.

Sublimated to its very utmost, nature cannot originate or reach a life-union with God. By the powers of thought, memory, or will, no man can plant himself in Christ. Thought-power can and has achieved wonders; measured circling worlds, and mapped their paths in the vast empyrean. But it cannot transcend its own order; cannot generate grace, and make it a personal possession and power. Our apprehension of the grace already apprehending us, must be in its own order and form. By birth we stand in the order of natural life; and it is by a *spiritual birth* that we come to stand in this new order of being. "*Born*," we hear the forecasting John Baptist saying, "not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (St. John i. 13). Starting from its Principle and Root in the form of life, it is only by a life-communicating act, going out from its central Source, that it is made primarily to reach us; an act from above, not from below; a sacramental, supernatural act. Our union with Christ is effected by the Holy Ghost, "the Lord and Giver of life," through the Holy Sacrament of Baptism, for this reason called *the bath of the New Birth*—*διὰ λουτροῦ παλγενεσίας* (Titus iii. 5), "the washing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." But what man, of his own motion only, will profanely dare to take this power on himself?

The conception of Christianity thus reached—a new order of life starting in the Incarnation, and not a system of doctrine simply in advance, it is true, of all that had hitherto been given, nor yet a better code of morals merely—rules and determines in this same way our view of the Church, the divinely constituted organ and medium of that life. Organic Redemption is thus seen to carry along with it, also, this indispensable postulate: The Church, the Mystical Body of Christ.

All life is EMBODIED. A body is an organism; a constitution of vital forces and functions, all the parts standing together in

a common ground: the depository and outward, visible manifestation of an inward, hidden principle of vitality; a life's objectivity. The very idea of life requires such externalization. Without it, it is, in fact, the sheerest abstraction, without reality and without power. It must take a concrete form. The inward and the outward here are correlated forces. They belong necessarily to each other; the one only making its own existing presence evident by the realness of the other. The ideal and the actual are ever seen going together, the actual being the complementary form of the ideal and the true. It is thus we speak of the constitution of outward nature, the constitution of civil government, and the human constitution; each, in its own order and form, the self-unfolded embodiment of life-powers.

The Incarnation of Christ, the complex of the Divine and the human, was the manifested presence of the theanthropic life, the one "Great Mystery of Godliness." Nothing ephemeral and visionary; nothing fabulous; no illusion and empty show of divinity; no mere temporary, but a permanent fact; a movement of truly perennial character and force, involving the ages, and binding in one the ends of the world, all that this redemption was in the person of Christ, originally, it was intended ever afterwards to be in the withdrawal of His visible presence; a thing only possible in an outward, visible, existing constitution, its concrete historical reality, standing in the bosom of human history, and moving onward with it, thus making real the actual presence of that great redemption, from age to age, until the millennium kingdom itself shall be ushered in by His glorious re-appearing. To preserve itself from falling away into a mere spiritual abstraction, empty and barren, this perpetual life-power is thus seen projecting itself into history, under an objective, organized form; taking to itself a body.

Archbishop Taylor caught the inspiration of this truth, when he characterized the Church as "the extension of the Incarnation." By St. Paul, it is called the "BODY OF CHRIST" (Eph. i. 23; ii. 16; iv. 4, 12, 16; v. 30; Col. i. 18, 24; ii. 19; iii. 15; Rom. xii. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 15; x. 17; xii. 12, 27), and this

not without the deepest reality and truth. This is the aspect under which this Apostle is continually presenting the Church, a spiritual organism; the depository of the life of Christ; a supernatural constitution of which He is the Head, from whom all spiritual vitality and power flow out, as natural life from the head to the members, in which they continually stand as a common ground. "A living head," says the distinguished German theologian, just cited, "is not to be thought of apart from the body. No redeemed Church without a Redeemer; but just as little a perfect Redeemer without a Church. Christ is made complete in His people." Again, "Christianity is in the fullest sense organic, in its nature. It reveals itself as a peculiar order of life in Christ, and from Him as a Personal Centre, it reaches forth towards man as a whole, in the way of true historical self-evolution, seeking to form the entire race into a glorious kingdom of God."

It is, indeed, utterly impossible to conceive how the coming of the Son of God in the flesh, could at all otherwise have reached its own end. If that stupendous act of the New Creation, in its unspeakable grandeur going even far beyond the act of creation in the beginning, meant anything at all, it certainly meant "the *incorporation* of this higher element into the actual onflowing life-stream of the world, in a form answerable to the conditions of it from one period to another, and in such sort as to be the central force of it, bearing all along continuously towards its own divinely appointed end."

Christ's coming in the flesh, we have termed the living Root of Christianity. But ROOT-LIFE, it is well understood, is never a thing by itself, isolated and disconnected. Already under the form of seed-life, itself the product of what had gone before, it belonged to, and was directly connected with antecedent life. All life thus is a product of the past. Stretching continually forward to the future, it yet has its roots set deep in anterior processes long gone.

Nor was the Incarnation, historically viewed, any disjointed movement, wholly dissevered from the past, its first point of

contact with the race that marvellous one when, in a true human birth, it became a Divine-human actuality. It was no such segregated and detached wonder; a sporadic and unheralded event, like the momentary glare of a meteor, flashing athwart the evening sky, and then disappearing in the darkness, and lost forever; something standing separate and apart from all that in the way of history had gone before or came after.

Properly apprehended, it was in fact a vast movement of grace, starting, at least, in the way of Christological presentiment and promise, in the very ground-work of human society, and reaching forward continually in its own yearning bosom to the Personal realization of its full sense and end. Though Bethlehem's "Word made flesh" was not cradled at the very foot of the tree of human misery, whence disobedience plucked the deadly fruit; though the serpent-Bruiser followed not at once in the slimy trail of the serpent; though the Cross, death bringing life again, was not planted right at the gate of the defended Eden, yet, in the way of prophetic announcement, redemption was already a present fact. Long ages of types and temple services, sacrifices and shadows of better things, prophets and priests intervening, nevertheless, as ever coming more distinctly forward, it was still that movement which, in the mighty hand of the Maker of history, was divinely linking the clouded past with the clear noon of Incarnate Mercy. Incorporated in the turbid stream of human life, as its pulsating heart and endeavor, it is truly historical. No empty abstraction, but the informing struggle of fallen humanity, it has, as in the sin-imposed necessities of the case it must have, a *pre-* as well as *post-*Advent history. In the great Edenic promise, it was rooted in the past, going back to the mournful reverse of the fortunes of the race, and mingling the clarion-note of hope with the first bitter wail wrung by sin from the human heart. Those antecedent ages, in their unanswered yearnings, were ripening and preparing for the full realization of the struggling Hope, itself becoming more defined and clear, as the "Fullness of the time" came rolling in. The Incarnation came in thus, itself the last sense and meaning of all antecedent history: the gathering up, in

one grand and glorious fulfillment, of its weary ages of darkly worded prophecies and deferred hopes.

And when at last the Personal answer came to all these Christological yearnings, it was not, we have already seen, another Minerva-like wonder, a full grown God-man, but One starting with human life in its embryonic mystery, and so being organically rooted to the whole unfruitful past of the race. Following the fortunes of this tried One, redemption very clearly maintains its organic and historical character. Nothing in fact could well be more truly so, than the evangelical history itself, the Life of Christ, man's Lord and Saviour. St. Luke puts it before us in the actual form of historical progress; a process reaching from the angelic annunciation, and His Spirit-prepared habitation in the womb of the Virgin (i. 35); followed in due time by His heaven-signalized birth; embracing, then, the whole cycle of His outward and inward human development, physical, psychical and ethical; His increase in wisdom and stature, His steady advance in Divine and human favor (ii. 52); and ending at last only in His full glorification (xxiv. 26), and undoubted re-appearance (Acts i. 10, 11), Himself standing in glorious array and power at the world's last end. And so, too, St. Paul, with his clear, strong grasp of the unity and continuity of these progressive facts, is seen joining together the last grand act in the bloody tragedy of the cross, and its lowly beginning in the unsounded depths of His astounding Self-humiliation. "Who being in the *form of God*, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the *form of a servant*, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (Phil. ii. 5-11). What have we in this sublime passage but a grand and graphic epitome of the evangelical his-

tory itself? the whole sense of the blessed Gospel being bound up in the wondrous unity of the facts making up the wondrous Life of that Incarnate Word, dwelling among men. Any conception other than this is only a vain and miserable endeavor, in a loose way, to tie together the sundered threads of the great Redemption.

But now that grand possibility of redemption, in spite of all the malice of hell and the pursuing hate of man, fully actualized in Him, drops not its historical character with the concluding wonder of that sublime and sinless life. The Scriptures are ever joining the second to the first Advent of our Lord as itself only the complete sense and last meaning of the entire movement, thus binding in the unity of a perfect whole, the supernatural end and the supernatural beginning. This necessarily involves an unbroken continuity in the process; and that, of course, not in any purely abstract and notional way, but after its own order, alike organic and historical with the person and life of the Redeemer, alone answerable to the perennial and enduring character of His own work. Thus the projection of the life of this glorified One into the onward flow of the world's life, under a concrete historical form, was, in the continual efficacy of the scheme itself, as must readily be seen, an absolute necessity.

Not complete in itself, root-life reaches forward to and comes at last to its own fullness in TREE-LIFE. The oak is the complement of the acorn, the full realization of all it precontained. These stand related, not as cause and effect, but commencement and continuance; principle and organic product; correspondent parts; complementaries; the one suggesting the other; needing the other. In Ecclesiasticus (xlii. 25), the "Son of Sirach" writes: "All things are *double*, one against another, and there is nothing imperfect." By which we understand this: nothing is complete in itself, but finds its perfection and the fulfillment of its appointed end wholly in union with another thing, of one order with it, made for it and adapted to it; its counterpart and complement; one making up the deficiencies of the other, and both essential to the fullness of the Divine idea.



The Incarnation and Pentecost's immediate and permanent result, the institution of the Church, are such correlated forces. St. Paul's soteriological terminology, like St. John's, is at once both significant and profound. He calls Christ, "The Fullness," i. e. *complement*, "of the Godhead bodily" (Col. ii. 9, *πάν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς*). But now, how may the Incarnate Lord be said to be the *complement*, the filling up, or making good what was wanting in God? Can there, indeed, be said to be any deficiency in God; anything needing in any way to be supplemented? The very thought, it must be admitted, is at first startling. Instinctively we start back from the bare idea. So Olshausen regards it in reference even to the Church being the complement of Christ. We are ready at once to urge, and urge it strongly, Does not the idea of imperfection in God, destroy the whole character of God? And the answer is promptly and unhesitatingly returned, certainly. But the want in God, here intimated, met and made good in Christ, let it be fairly borne in mind, is no incompleteness in the Divine Essence (*θεότης*, *Deitas*, *das Gottsein*, Godhead), but simply in the formal manifestation of the Divine Perfectness; the reference being, not to the inherent, but only the *communicated* plenitude of God. Let us not shrink, then, from pushing our inquiries reverently into the Apostle's own profound sense of this sublimest of the metaphors given to Christ.

Not majestic isolation and solitary grandeur, nor the inert and inglorious rest of profound Self-contemplation, an infinite abstraction, but Self-revelation was the deepest principle in God Himself. Hence, *creationally*, the general constitution of nature, from its lowest form, inorganic matter, up to man, the crown and interpretation of the whole cosmical order. But man, the last sense and intelligent voice of the material creation, is not complete in himself. He yearns for and reaches out after union with God, in which alone both nature and man at length come to their full, climactic glory. This is the deep meaning of those weary centuries of earnest expectation going before the Advent; St. Paul, in his broad grasp of the truth, telling us that crea-

tion to its utmost bound groaned and travailed in pain, waiting and reaching out after the great day of its own deliverance. But it is in Christ, however, where this Self-revelation on the part of God takes its highest and last form. Here it is not a creational revelation, resulting, by His power, in something different from Himself; but it is His *ESSENTIAL* revelation, ending in the way of *FULLNESS*—Christ being the Fullness of the God-head *bodily*. Thus the manifestation of God in the flesh was no incidental thing merely; not something contingent on the bare fact of sin, and for which Satan alone, by his nefarious counter-work, had made room and furnished the absolute necessity; but something which would and must have been in order to complete and crown the whole creation on its cosmical, ethical and historical side.

Now to fallen man, absolute Deity, God not clothed in the form and fashion of our being, is inaccessible; nay, the very thought is intolerable. In His own coming in the flesh, bringing to its completion the whole objective process of God's own Self-revelation, Christ certainly was the *complement* of God; the full and proper Personal Expression of Himself to man (*χαράχρη τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*, Heb. i. 3); His own Self-reflection (*εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου*, Col. i. 15; *ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, 2 Cor. iv. 4);\* the living Mirror, as it were, in

---

\* "The expression *εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ* supplements the title of 'the Son.' As 'the Son,' Christ is derived eternally from the Father, and He is of One Substance with the Father. As 'the Image,' Christ is, in that One Substance, the exact likeness of the Father, in all things except being the Father. The Son is the Image of the Father, not as the Father, but as God: the Son is 'the Image of God.' The *εἰκὼν* is indeed originally God's unbegun, unending reflection of Himself in Himself; but the *εἰκὼν* is also the Organ whereby God, in His Essence invisible, reveals Himself to His creatures. Thus the *εἰκὼν* is, so to speak, naturally the Creator, since creation is the first revelation which God has made of Himself. Man is the highest point in the visible universe; in man, God's attributes are most luminously exhibited; man is the image and glory of God (1 Cor. xi. 7). But Christ is the Adequate Image of God, God's Self-reflection in His own thought, eternally present with Himself." *Our Lord's Divinity*, by Rev. Henry Parry Liddon; *Bampton Lectures for 1866*, p. 317. "St. Paul calls Him the *Image of the invisible God*, meaning by this that it is in Him alone that God, who is otherwise invisible, is manifested to us, in accordance with what is said in St. John i. 18, 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him.'" *Calvin in loc.*

which He shows Himself fully to man, and man, drawing ever so nigh, can look upon Him without fear and trembling. Thus Christ, God's own Image, revealing in Himself the Father to man *in* man, and man to himself, while at the same time forming the needed Personal medium through which man comes to a full apprehension of, and, in the end, free and face to face communion with God, may well, in St. Paul's own profound language, be styled, "All the Fullness of the Godhead *bodily*;" and there should be no hesitancy whatever in accepting the Apostle's sublime words in this very sense: Christ, God's own Image and Self-reflection, the Complement of the Invisible Father; ὁ Λόγος τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐν ἰδέᾳ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ.\*

So the Church, as we shall presently see, is only rightly apprehended, when taken to be a constituent part, and, therefore, the inevitable sequence and necessary complement of this great "Mystery of Godliness."

The Incarnation was not a fact by itself, but looked forward to another Divine movement as its own proper conclusion, and the fulfillment of its appointed end through all time. Not once and no more, but once and always was the inlying necessity of the case; something continually operative; of truly enduring and abiding character. In the days of our Lord's flesh, persons sought Him out in His retreat; brought their troubles to His own gracious ears; brought their children to Him to be taken in His arms; touched the hem of His garments; washed His feet with their penitent tears. Then the whole power of redemption was localized and limited to His person. It journeyed with the journeying Saviour; now in Judea, now in

---

\* Olshausen takes πᾶν τὸ πλῆρωμα τῆς θεότητος to be the Godhead, *essentialiter*, *substantialiter*: God being *essentially* present in Christ. In this he is right; Christ being, not a *deified* man merely, but the concrete God-man. Primarily the Apostle's sublime expression is directed against the Gnostic error of supposing "a merely temporary influence of a higher spirit upon Jesus, from His Baptism to His death." Admitting the truth and full force of all this, instead of making anything against, it only gives strength and point to, what has just been maintained, viz., Christ, in the *essentialness* of His Godhead and the *essentialness* also of His Humanity, being the Complement of God. Alford states it thus, "Before His Incarnation the fullness dwelt in Him, as the λόγος ἄσαρκος, but not σωματικῶς, as that now He is the λόγος ἐνσαρκος."

Galilee, now in the intermediate Samaria. But such personal localization of the great redemption was far from answering its own universal end. He came to be, not the Saviour of Jerusalem, a little and remote corner of the earth, but of the world. Grace now is to stream out from Him in all directions like rays of light from the sun; go beyond its fontal Source; break through the narrow boundaries of once favored Palestine; travel beyond the seas; travel with the weariless foot of man; go forth to the world's conquest; "conquering and to conquer;" a mission utterly impossible in the visibility of the Saviour fixed and localized in one spot, one part of the earth, remote from all the rest in space and time; and not possible any other wise than by a Divine Person capable, in His invisibility, of being universally present, and also, in a self-chosen organ, the embodiment, by virtue of His presence, of all the powers of the New Creation, capable of moving forward with true supernatural energy and effect, through the ages, in the unfolding of this, God's active and comprehensive grace.

In the disappearance of Christ after the flesh, the scheme of redemption by no means comes to an abrupt and inglorious end. The historical realness of the Incarnation demands, in the way of constitutional and inevitable sequence, its continuance under its own proper objective historical form. His Ascension thus, we are told, was itself in order to the Mission of the Holy Ghost; and the descent of the Holy Ghost was in order to the actual organization of the Church. He tells us Himself, all this was involved in His own glorification. "Sorrow hath filled your hearts. Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you" (St. John xvi. 7), are His own full words to the sorrowing disciples; the withdrawal of His temporary presence after the flesh making room for His continuous and far more effective presence, by the Spirit, in the Church. As thus included in the great Ascension-Gift, the Church comes before us as the real objective historical continuity and *complement* of the Incarnation itself. In this truly Pentecostal Pro-

duct, the Divine Mustard Seed, Bethlehem's Incarnate Mystery, takes on its organic and historical counterpart, and, becoming "the TREE OF LIFE," stretches out its sheltering branches the world over, and bears, far and wide, through the long sweep of the ages, those leaves which are for the healing of the nations (Rev. xxii. 2).<sup>\*</sup> Co-extensive with humanity, and designed actually, as already germinally, to embrace it, the Incarnation does in fact only enter, under a form answering its own objective historical character, upon its world-wide mission and efficiency in the perpetual Miracle of Pentecost.

This view of the constituent and inevitable sequence of the Lord's coming in the flesh will serve to give us a true insight into the Apostle's sense of his own words, when he styles the Church "His Body, the Fullness," *i. e. complement*, again, "of Him that filleth all in all" (Eph. i. 23). Certainly there can be no mistaking St. Paul's meaning here. Head and body are correlated forces, organically connected. The head, the seat and centre of life, is the organizing and vitalizing power. But a vitalizing power is a nonentity, an empty abstraction, without its own appropriate organ of activity. A life connection, being always a connection of power, makes for itself a life-sphere. The body is the sphere of the head's vitality; and so its necessary complement. Together they make a living whole. And so here. Christ is styled the Head, and the

---

<sup>\*</sup> "The Gift of the Holy Ghost," says Dr. Nevin, "forms in a certain sense the end or *completion* of the Gospel. In it the 'Mystery of Godliness,' the economy of redemption, came first to its full perfection as the power of God, not in purpose merely, but in actual reality, for the salvation of the world. What was begun when the Word became Flesh in the Virgin's womb, was brought here to its proper consummation. The Incarnation of Christ and the Mission of the Holy Ghost stand related to each other, not simply as cause and effect, but as commencement and conclusion of one and the same grand fact. The first was in order to the last, and looked forward to it continually as its own necessary issue and scope." Again, "The Holy Ghost, in this view, is not one among other gifts for which the world is indebted to Christ, but the sum and absolute unity at once of the whole, the Gift of gifts; that without which there could be no room to conceive of any other, and through which only all others have their significance and force. It is that which men need as the very *complement* of their life, that they may be redeemed from the power of the fall, and raised to a participation of the Divine nature (2 Peter i. 4), having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust." *Mer. Rev.* 1856, pp. 69, 72.

Church, His Body, the sphere of His actual Presence and Efficiency in the world through all time. Standing to each other in the relation of complementaries, answering counterparts, they form the two great sections of the one great scheme of redemption: the Incarnate Wonder in the end coming to its own proper conclusion and full scope in the Pentecostal Wonder. Just as Christ's material body, the dwelling and human organism of the wholeness of the Divine Essence, was the complement in being the Personal Self-reflection of God; so the Church, His Mystical Body, the dwelling and human organism of His whole, undivided Person, is His complement in being that supernatural constitution of grace which, by the Spirit, completes, fills up, and makes good, by perpetuating, carrying forward, and making actually present and real, age after age, until the millennium itself shall be ushered in, the saving merits of the One atoning Life. Thus the Living Head finds in the Church His own necessary complementary, a life-bearing Body, constituted such by the renewal of the Incarnate Miracle in the Descent of the Holy Ghost on His perpetual Errand. "It is," says Alford, "veritably His Body: not that which in our glorified humanity He personally bears, but that in which He, as the Christ of God, is manifested and glorified by spiritual organization. He is its Head; from Him comes its life; in Him, it is exalted; in it, He is lived forth and witnessed to; He possesses nothing for Himself,—neither His communion with the Father, nor His fullness of the Spirit, nor His glorified humanity,—but all for His Church, which is in the innermost reality HIMSELF; His flesh and His bones,—and therefore *THE FULLNESS*; *πλήρωμα* being in apposition with *τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ*, a fresh description of *ἡ ἐκκλησία*."

Further proof that this complementary sense of the Church is no strange thought in the New Testament is found in its ecclesiological terminology. By the act of the great Creator, man and woman were made correlatives. They belong to each other; were constituted for each other; and need each other. Originally an extract from man, the woman comes in to complete, in the oneness of the marital relation, the Divine Idea of

man. St. Paul does not for a moment hesitate to take this closest and most intimate earthly relation as an exact representation of the self-communicating relation of Christ to His Church, calling it a "great mystery" (Eph. v. 32). "As Eve was formed from the body of Adam, so the Church proceeds from the divine-human life of the Saviour (Eph. v. 30), and from it is knit together and increaseth" (Col. ii. 19).<sup>\*</sup> It was just this sense of the complementary character of the Church, as set forth in this classic passage of St. Paul (Eph. v. 23-33), that led Hooker to style it, "a true native extract out of Christ's body." Serving perpetually to bring to full realization the appointed end of the Incarnation, it is not without the deepest significance that the Church is thus called, "THE BRIDE" (Rev. xxi. 2; xxii. 17); "THE LAMB'S WIFE" (Rev. xix. 7; xxi. 9; Eph. v. 32); "THE MOTHER OF US ALL" (Gal. ii. 26); terms all expressive of the necessity of just such a complementary organism, itself a constituent part of Christianity, as will answer in full spiritually to the sphere and office of woman in the human world.<sup>†</sup>

Besides being embodied, all life is MEDIATED AND CONDITIONED; stands in the warm bosom of germinating and nurturing forces; apprehending them and being apprehended by them. Mediation runs alike through the realms of nature and grace.

<sup>\*</sup> *Gess, On the Person of Christ, trans. by Rev. Dr. Reubelt, p. 299.*

<sup>†</sup> After this view of the subject had suggested itself to my mind, in pursuing the study of Complementaries for a different purpose altogether, on consulting authorities, I found it sustained by the most eminent, ancient and modern, with some exceptions. Chrysostom says: "*The fullness of Christ is the Church.* And rightly, for the complement of the head is the body, and the complement of the body is the head. Mark what great arrangement Paul observes, how he spares not a single word, that he may represent the glory of God. *The Complement*, he says, i. e. the head is, as it were, filled up by the body, because the body is composed and made up of all its several parts, and hath need of every one. Observe how he introduces Him as having need of all alike; for unless we be many, and one be the hand, and another the foot, and another some other member, the whole body is not filled up. It is by all then that His body is filled up. Then is the head filled up, then is the body rendered perfect, when we are altogether, all knit together and united." *Homilies on Eph. in loc. Library of the Fathers; Oxford, 1845; p. 128.* So Jerome. "The head and the body," says Augustine, "are one man; Christ and the Church are one man, a perfect man; He the bridegroom, and she the bride. And they shall be two in one flesh." Calvin says: "*The fullness of Him that filleth,*" etc. This is



Everywhere nature is seen to be one vast system of mediatorial powers and processes; sacraments, one may call them, ordained by the great Creator to subserve, in this lower sphere, the ends of natural life. In the world of animated nature, there is no such thing as life standing separate and apart from all conditioning and mediating operations and offices. Of necessity, everything of that sort is only apparitional, shadowy and unsubstantial.

Human life, everybody knows, stands in a varied ministry of Divine bounty. There is here no independence. Every moment, and at every point, we are made to own our dependence upon an appointed mediatorial arrangement of vast and varied order. Food comes, but not as God dropped manna around the tented camps of Israel; not as He fed Elijah in the rugged solitudes of Cherith. Golden sheaves fall not, like rain-drops, from the skies. The miracle of nature is not that. Nor are the cereals spontaneous products. Here God is ever employing man as the mediator of His needed mercy. In some sort, the hand of industry is a priestly hand: the channel by which the Divine supply is made to reach human want. There is no possibility of repudiating and setting aside man's priesthood here.

In the sphere of physical supplies, the miracle of the loaves and fishes is ever being repeated: "He (Christ) distributed to the disciples, and *the disciples* to them that were set down" (St. John vi. 11). The bread passes to the fainting multitude through the ministry of human hands. Others, by the ap-

---

the highest honor of the Church, that, until He is united to us, the Son of God reckons Himself in some measure imperfect. What consolation is it for us to learn, that, not until we are along with Him, does He possess all His parts, or wish to be regarded as complete!" *Com. in loc.* Braune says, "Πλήρωμα is taken in the active sense as *supplementum*." *Lange's Com. in loc.* To these other names might be added. Olshausen objects to this view in the following words: "The interpretation of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, Beza, Calvin, according to which τὸ πλήρωμα is to be understood of the Church in so far as it is *complementum*, the complement of the κεφαλὴ, by which the body is made complete, has everything against it so entirely that no serious mention of it can be made." He seems to think that the deepest significance of the metaphor, as applied to the Church, lies in bringing its high dignity prominently to view. Nothing could well come further short of the actual truth in the case.

pointment of the Personal Power whence its marvellous increase came, had the work of distribution devolved upon them. The Divine gift is here seen to have been dispensed not by Christ immediately, but mediately, by His disciples. And so now, in the matter of daily subsistence every man's hand is a helping hand. We are necessary to others; others are necessary to us. Our labors, in some sort, enter into other men's supplies; other men's labors enter into our supplies. Said the Saviour, "Other men labored, and ye are entered into their labors." The wheat from which our bread is made was grown, it may be, a thousand miles away. How many human hands were concerned in its reaching us! Great indeed was the company of mediators: God's rich mercy in fact passing to us through a varied human ministry. It matters little that nature is endowed with vast fertility. This only responds in Divine comforts and blessings as men are found using it. Men plow and plant; God gives sunshine and shower; the earth strength and nourishment until the ripened harvest. Thus, day by day, human life stands in the midst of numberless mediatorial activities and agencies: nature's sacraments.

Man's priesthood in this lower world, is but the picture of a like necessity and Divine arrangement in the higher sphere of his being. Not a whit less than mere natural life is spiritual life something mediated and conditioned. Just as little is it a naked and abstract thing; something notional; a purely mental act; an exercise of thought, memory, or will; a wholly private matter; an individual and independent affair; a transaction directly between a man's conscience and his God. On the other hand, by His arrangement, in whom nature and grace alike stand as their Root and Source, it rests equally in the bosom of spiritual powers and processes, sacramental ordinances and operations. And to be itself of any solid and substantial character, it must have its base in a real objective Christianity, finding in the sacramental system, obtaining in and by the Church, a full parallel to that vast and varied system of natural mediation already considered. Pure individualism here is

the sheerest abstraction; besides being a terrible deception and self-imposition to any one resting wholly in it.

There is, indeed, "one Mediator between God and men" (1 Tim. ii. 5), Christ Jesus, who alone, carrying the world's answered need and guilt up to God, won for it the heavenly blessings of God's reconciliation and pardon. But neither is He here a mere abstraction. As in the world of nature, so more especially here, He stands livingly at the head of an infinite series of mediatorial powers, in which He becomes real as the One only Mediator; the deepest ground thus both of nature and grace. So far from grace being a thing of mere imagination or fancy, it is a divinely communicated gift; the order of its communication being of God's own ordaining. "Spiritual blessings" stand "in heavenly places" (Eph. i. 3). The Church, carrying Christ to the world, mediates His gifts and the world's need. In carrying Christ to the world, she carries the resources of life and salvation; is the actual bearer of grace and help to the helpless. And so essential is her part in dispensing this grace, that, if her hands, the ordained medium through which the blessings are conveyed, are hanging idly by her side instead of plying their sacred ministry, the world must perish, even though the "Bread of Life" (St. John vi. 48) has been provided. With firmest faith holding on to the mediation of Christ, let us not lose sight of, nor, with folly most amazing, repudiate that other grand fact of revelation, completing on its Divine side the whole process of redemption, the mediation of the Church. In her sacred offices—ministry, services and sacraments, holding by the Lord's own appointment—the Church shares in the work and calling of the One Great Mediator.

In some quarters, the loud boast is, that Protestantism goes directly to Christ. And in this, it claims to be Evangelical *par excellence*; evangelical above and beyond all who in any way put the Church forward as the medium of salvation. It will hear nothing of such an intervening order of grace; raising a most furious outcry, something after the fashion of the old Indian war-whoop, against everything of the sort and every

one maintaining it; lifting up its hands in holy horror, and shouting vociferously, SACERDOTALISM, PRIESTLY INTERVENTION, SACRAMENTALISM, CHURCHISM, and what not, as if those catch-words of lynx-eyed heresy-hunters were going to scare a body out of the great truth: the work of salvation needing, and, in the offices of the Church, getting, a real priesthood on the part of that nature in the very bosom of which Christ Himself actually stood, binding thus in living unity and inseparable necessity the Divine and the human. The cry is intended to go for much; but after all it is empty rodomontade, mere pious bluster, if not worse: a Judas' treachery, the Gospel's betrayal at the very hands of its professed friends. If the cry carries with it at all intelligently its own sense of the Gospel, it means, and can only mean, that the Church is a hindrance instead of a help to piety, repudiating *in toto* every thought of its being the Divine and indispensable order of it, and ridiculing any earnest stress laid on the observance of its ordinances as superstition and formalism.

True to this spirit of depreciation of Church connection and ordinances, there are some who, eying exclusively the subjective side of religion, labor to persuade us, that deep convictions, pious feelings, individual experiences, are everything, the most important thing, the only vital and essential thing; thus putting subjective emotions, themselves ruled by mental currents and unsteady impulses, and, therefore, proverbially variable, like the sands of the desert coming and going with the wind, above the stupendous realities of an objective Christianity, made ever at hand in the Church. A serious wrong is done here to God's own method of salvation which, for the sake of souls, and the truth, and the Gospel in its own full sense, needs to be exposed and corrected.\*

---

\* These words from a recent volume have the true ring. "Men may talk boastfully of personal independence, but it comes to be but a poor thing when it is an independence of the holy mission and offices which are God's own merciful provisions for man's redemption, sanctification, and final salvation. This is an old enemy from which the race has already fearfully suffered. The angels were once ambitious to be independent of God, and for their reward, were cast down to the bottomless pit. That old serpent, the Devil, one of the fallen angels, instilled the same spirit into the first pair, saying, 'Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil'

This view, as is quite evident, breaks with the whole analogy of nature. Life, we have seen, always stands in its own proper order; is never anything ethereal and visionary. It does not, in any casual, random way, go leaping about from object to object, with no organic connection with its own proper ground. It does not run into plants promiscuously and lawlessly. A tree has not its roots in the skies, but rooted in the soil, as everybody sees, it grows by standing in its warm, genial bosom, and drinking up its rich juices. Only the abnormal forces of nature are thus wild and lawless; as, for instance, the wind, coming and going; as the lightning, flaring and flashing in a zig-zag way, falling when and where least expected, blasting, rending and tearing as it goes. And so here, the Christianity which boasts of its immediateness, going direct to Christ, independent of all sacramental agencies and activities, looking to the lightning-like afflatus of the Spirit, as being far more effectual, and making all account of subjective notions and fancies, is essentially wild, violent and windy.

Mere ideas, thoughts, notions, abstractions, cannot satisfy us. We refuse to be put off with the empty and ever-recurring images of mere fancy. This is true in everything. Not husks, nor yet the vision of a well-spread table will appease a hungry man's clamorous appetite. He needs to approach a veritable banquet and regale himself with the rich viands. Not the plan of a cathedral, however majestic and grand, will serve a worshiping people. That plan needs to be made an objective reality, and, consciously filled with the glory of the Divine presence, room be made, in the regular order of its service and administration of the holy sacraments, to meet the hungry soul with heavenly Food. Religion has its subjective side. It

---

(Gen. iii. 5). The struggle with men now is to bring themselves to comply with the terms of *this present dispensation*. 'The carnal mind' is still 'enmity against God.' It seeks isolation, independence. It ever tends to individualism. Not to recognize the interests of Christ and His Church as inseparable; to strike at one, as if to honor the other; to rend asunder the Body from the Head; to neglect the offices, institutions and appointments of the Church, is to abandon the whole Christian idea, is to accept the infidel idea, to take infidel ground." *The Conversion of St. Paul*, by Rev. George Jarvis Geer.

is, indeed, a deep sense of sin, and self-loathing because of it. It is pious feeling, and the earnest cultivation of personal holiness. It is strong and abiding faith. But the subjective, to prove itself something far more than vapid and empty feeling, must have a true and proper base to rest in—"the very realities themselves of that spiritual world in which Christ, now risen from the dead, continually lives and reigns."

Though frequently used interchangeably, we distinguish between *redemption* and *salvation*, taking the one to indicate more particularly the Divine, the other the human, side of the one great work of complete deliverance from the curse of sin. Redemption (*Ἀπολύτρωσις*) gives us the idea of deliverance by ransom from a condition of slavery; a buying back again.\* The redemption of sinners from the consequences of sin was by a Personal Ransom (Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14; 1 Cor. i. 30; Heb. ix. 12; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19). It stood, we have already seen, in its own Personal Order, the God-man, who is hence called our Redeemer, or, according to the Mediæval English Litany, "Again-buyer." By Redemption, the whole manward move of God's grace is specifically designated, taking, in the fullness of His own time, the form of a Personal approach to man *in* man, and, in the Mission of the Holy Ghost, establishing itself in the world, under a corporate, existing and historical form, in the Church, the organ and medium, in full and for all time, of this new-creative Life. Salvation, we take to be the active human side of the work; what St. Paul styles "the obedience of faith" (Rom. xvi. 26); the whole Godward movement on the part of man, holding in his personal apprehension and appropriation of that redemption, always at hand in the Church, by which he has first of all been apprehended by God; his obediently falling in with and diligently using the Divine order of grace. Redemption is an accomplished fact; a fact

---

\* St. Paul invariably employs this word, and not simply *λύσις*. Drawing attention to this fact, Chrysostom observes that by this *ἀντὶ*, the Apostle would express the completeness of our redemption in Christ Jesus. And Trench says, "The idea of deliverance, a price paid, is central in this word." *Synonyms of the New Test.*, p. 136.

of the past, indeed, but invested with perennial force and undying energy. Salvation is a process, starting in its sacramental beginning and reaching steadily forward to its "perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in God's eternal and everlasting glory." As such, like all life, it stands necessarily in its own appropriate and Divinely-appointed order.

This distinction is not a fanciful one. It holds in the very necessities of the case. It inheres, too, in the Holy Scriptures. It can be little questioned that here such an *order of salvation* has been plainly revealed. No one who takes the pains to look studiously into the sacred Word but will find that, from the beginning to the present time, God's method of saving men has been, "not only by working in them individual personal religion, but by joining them together in a body, or family, or kingdom, or Church." Especially does this recognition of the Church, as a Divine organization and the sole medium of salvation, come out in the New Testament.

Turning to the sacred narrative of the marvellous events following the Personal Descent of the Holy Ghost, we meet this explicit language: "And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved" (Acts ii. 47), τοὺς σωζομένους. The English version, "*should be saved,*" is an evident mistranslation; and, making salvation something altogether future, something reached only in heaven, gives an entirely false view to St. Peter's assertion. The word is a present participle, indicating thus an active personal co-operation. Accordingly, a better translation would be, those *being saved*; those who, by their personal act, were *in the way of salvation*. Salvation being thus the personal appropriation of the great redemption actually at hand in the Church, the saved are here represented as those who *were added to it*. Deciding nothing, one way or the other, as to the question whether all these were originally saved, it only asserts, says Alford, "that they were *in the way of salvation*, when they were added to the Christian assembly." The same word, σώθητε, is used in the 40th verse. "Save yourselves from this untoward generation," is the first Gospel preacher's



earnest injunction to those who had taken part in our Lord's crucifixion. But how? By getting out from amongst that perverse race doomed to destruction, "renouncing Judaism, abandoning their prejudices, seeking admission into the Christian Church, and thus being saved from their sins by the washing of regeneration, and put into a *state* of salvation; whence, by the grace imparted under the Gospel, they might be *actually* saved both from the guilt and the power of sin."\*

That the Church, in its ministry, offices, and sacraments, was thus appointed to come between the sinner and the Saviour, receives remarkable confirmation in the direction given by Christ personally to the trembling Paul. The cry, "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do" (Acts ix. 6) ? is at once recognized as the impulsive question of that man prostrated by overwhelming conviction. Here is the reality of that fond fancy, a sinner standing face to face with his Saviour. The sanguinary Paul finds himself in the very presence of the Personal Christ. "And the Lord said, I AM Jesus whom thou persecutest." There was no possibility of mistaking the Person who met him in his way of blood. Alluding to this very interview St. Paul afterwards said, "Last of all He (Christ) was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time" (1 Cor. xv. 8). Awed and trembling, the sinner recognized the Personal, present Saviour. But now what answer does Christ Himself return to the sinner's anxious inquiry? Is immediate pardon of his accumulated and crimson guilt granted? Does the Lord in person directly absolve him? Does the pretension of going direct to Christ receive from Him the seal of Highest endorsement? Does He set aside His own established order of grace? Does He dispense with His own ordinances? "Does He take back to Himself, even in this one instance, and for a special purpose, that which He had commissioned His visible Church to do in His name?"

Most important and instructive here, in their bearing on Church truth, are the Saviour's direction and the sinner's course. He

---

\* Bloomfield's Greek Test. in loc.

is the sinner's only Saviour. From Him alone all forgiveness must proceed. And He is there face to face with that subdued and crushed man, "to do this work, if it is to be done independently of the Church on earth." But so far from repudiating the ministry which He had put between the world and Himself and pouring contempt upon His own ordinances, by His own explicit act of recognition He puts the highest honor on the *order of salvation* He had Himself established. In the view of our radical Protestantism, what a mockery of that convicted man's feelings, making his confusion worse confounded, must have been our Lord's reply, "Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do" (Acts ix. 6)!

But it was by no means so to the trembling convert himself. In one of his own accounts of that turning incident in his life, he tells us, he was not slow to *obey* "the heavenly vision" (Acts xxvi. 19). Indeed, the unquestioning readiness, under the circumstances, with which he entered upon the course indicated, is one of the most refreshing features in that remarkable event. The Saviour had spoken, and the blind convert, heeding His word, quietly suffers himself to be led. And in what follows, this comes forward prominently, *the recognition of the Church as the Divine medium of salvation*. Men dream of salvation independent of the Church, and in no way connected with and mediated by its holy sacraments. Nothing in our day is more common and sad than this sundering of salvation from its clearly divinely-appointed order. The willing submission of this distinguished convert to the voice of Ananias, Christ's minister in the case, "Why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," is a withering, because Divine, rebuke to every pretension of the sort.

It was Christ who, by express direction, put the intervening ordinance between the sinner and Himself, the Saviour. "All that Ananias does and says to Paul is said and done in His name and by His authority. Perish forever before this act of Christ Himself every aspersion of man against the Holy Offices and Ministrations of the Visible Church of Christ here upon

earth! In and through Ananias Christ touched and healed him. Christ, the only Source of grace: Ananias, the visible channel of that grace. The waters of Baptism, the clay upon the eyes; Christ the power which says, *Be opened!*"\*

The notional conception of Christianity, coming so far short of the grand and glorious reality, the prevailing one, too, it must be sadly admitted, in our reigning Protestantism, starts in a faulty view of the Person of Christ. The two are essentially related. Nothing is surer than is a Gnostic Christ to dissipate the whole idea of the Church into thin air, making it necessarily something altogether shadowy and visionary. The true Divine-human Christ, on the other hand, is just as certain to give us an organization alike Divine-human in its constitution; the supernatural again in the natural; the heavenly "treasure in earthen vessels" (2 Cor. iv. 7); a real constitution of gracious powers, answering for spiritual ends all that the constitution of outward nature is for mere natural ends; making in fact the only sphere where "the powers of the world to come" touch and lay hold, in any real way, on our common fallen life.

That view of Christ, accordingly, which reduces Him to the level simply of a teacher of truth gives us a corresponding one-sided and faulty conception of the Church. Had He been a teacher of truth only, of one order with the ancient prophets, nearer the truth, it may be; then, of necessity, Christianity can be nothing more than a system of doctrine, and His relation to it nothing beyond the mere formal relation of the founder to his particular school of philosophy, while man's only point of contact with Him and it must be exclusively of the understanding, an exercise purely of thought and memory. In this view, the Church necessarily becomes nothing more than a pedagogic institution, a sort of didactic arrangement, and preaching its main, if not its exclusive work; the sacra-

---

\* "*The Conversion of St. Paul*," by Rev. George Jarvis Geer.

ments only doing symbolically what more formally, and, as some would have it, is far more effectually done by the public ministrations of the Word.

But we have already learned, that Christ was far more than Plato or Aristotle, Confucius or Mohammed; far more than Moses and the Prophets; humanity's fresh Beginning, its regenerative Head, its second Adam; its new Life-Tree. This new life claims, and, through the Spirit, has made for itself a real constitution of grace, a constitution of spiritual forces to be sure, nevertheless substantial activities, as much so, nay, more so, than those even finding their actual embodiment in the natural world; "For the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal" (2 Cor. iv. 18). As a *life* it is not to be put off with the purely notional, mere signs and shadows, empty and unsatisfying crudities, the very mockery, if they be nothing worse, of the deepest needs of our nature. It claims for itself the actual presence and power still of all that Christ was in substance, standing in the warm bosom of quickening and nurturing forces of its own order. Hence, entering the world as the new life of humanity, Christianity has *incorporated* itself in the onflowing stream of history in a form answerable to its own end and necessities, making itself all that the Head intended it should be: the real depository of His own life, and the central power of the world onward.

The form of these mediatorial activities was no incidental thing; no lucky affair of chance; no happy hit of pious ingenuity merely, man's *contrivance* for the better cultivation of personal holiness; but a matter of Divine forethought and settlement. It was God who ordained the manifold forms of vegetable and animal life. These were in no sense the result of mere fortuity. It was God who gave to man his upright form; made him the up-looking one, with wonderful fitness called by the Greeks *ὁ ἀνθρώπος*, from *ὁ ἀνα ἄθρων*. Certainly his erectness, while all animals go with their head bent downward, is not to be put down to accident, nor the last reach of mere development. In the sphere of animated nature, it was God's crowning work. And so here. As this new life of the

race is no mere abstract and notional thing, its Author has given to it such a body as pleased Him. It was He who, by the Spirit, constituted the Church, the Mystical Body of His Son. The projection into time of all the resources of life and salvation originally comprehended in the person of His Incarnate Son, it is named the BODY of Christ; therefore, that objective, existing, and historical organization, by which we come into vital union and communion with this sole Source of Life. But of little account is the name of this constitution of grace, only so that we do not, in our conception of the Church, let go the blessed reality itself. The Saviour Himself calls it His Church (St. Matt. xvi. 18), and that characterizes the thing itself sufficiently for us: the appointed medium, first of ingrafting into this New Stock of humanity; and, secondly, the organ continually of spiritual strength and nourishment. Next then to the mediation of Christ, now carried forward on the glorious throne of His interceding nearness to the Father, is this other associated fact, of a like indispensable character, the mediation of the Church.

All this now will help us to a right conception of the Church: its constitution and the place it holds in the entire movement of grace.

Of primary importance is the question: Is the Church of the very essence of Christianity? or is it an adjunct simply? Does it enter as a constituent element into the economy of Redemption, its necessary form and order? or does it belong merely to the *proprieties of religion*; a convenient aid to devotion, a human expedient for the cultivation of piety? The inquiry, it is easily seen, goes to the very foundation of the whole immense interest. Its significance cannot well be overrated. The whole future of Christianity hangs upon it. Would that our radical Protestantism could so understand it, and make common cause in what so vitally concerns the very Gospel itself! But of this we have little hope at present, considering the madness of the times. "Prejudice and passion are deaf and blind."

The vital character of the issues at stake has thus very directly and earnestly been put by Dr. Nevin. "This, if we look at it rightly, is the question of questions for the subject before us, that on which turns the whole significance of the controversy concerning the Church. This is that last profound issue, towards which, whether with full consciousness or not, all other issues in the minds of men on the subject of the Church flow naturally as to their proper end, and in the bosom of which alone it is possible for them to be brought to any final and full solution. Accordingly as this question may be either affirmed or denied, all other questions appertaining to the Church-system will be found to retain or lose their interest. If the question be affirmed, and the only true and proper idea of the Church is held to be that which is expressed by such answer, it is easy to see how at once all points flowing from it, or depending upon it in any way, must acquire a corresponding solemnity of sense; how they must be considered no longer as things of curious and vain speculation merely, but as matters of deep practical import; how it must be felt, that instead of bearing to Christianity the relation simply of outward accidents or adiaphorous forms, they reach in truth to its inmost heart, and have to do with the deepest spiritualities of its life. Let the answer, on the contrary, fall the other way, so that the Church shall be held to be no necessary constituent of Christianity, but only an arrangement joined to it from without, and it becomes then just as easy to see, how at once all points connected with it must be shorn, to a corresponding extent, of their meaning and interest, and how it can never be anything more than pedantry at best to lay any great stress upon them, or make them the subject of earnest strife one way or another. It is a poor business surely to stickle for forms, where the whole idea is disowned which can make them to be of any force. Without faith in the mystery of the Church, as being the real bearer of heavenly and supernatural powers, to what can it amount to be zealous for the mere modes of its action, the mere circumstantials of its Constitution."\*

---

\* *Thoughts on the Church.* *Mer. Rev.*, 1858, p. 189.

Thus far this noble man who, against an amount of personal aspersion and low abuse which no man on either continent has been subjected to, has yet so earnestly and boldly grappled with the most vital questions of religion, the age, and humanity, leading many a tossed soul into a more solid and appreciative sense of the wholeness of God's one scheme of redemption. We make no apology for the long quotation. It puts the whole subject before us in its true and only defensible aspect.

The Incarnation, we have already seen, was a reality on both sides. No Gnostic phantom or dream, a mere passing wonder, but of permanent force in the world, taking hold of its deepest life, it necessarily *presupposed* from the start, a wider sphere of activity than the bodily and local presence of Christ. His bodily disappearance, as just stated, was in fact but to make room for the Incarnation, in its true dynamic character, to enter upon the perpetual fulfillment of its own end, under its widest, most extended and enduring form. Not this, however, by the discrowning of Christ in the enthronement of an entirely new and separate power, but the continuation of His own mission under its only possible historical and most efficient form. Hence, the mystery of the Incarnation looking to, is, in due time, followed by a second mystery, the abiding presence of the Holy Ghost in the world, in the one Holy Catholic Church, the Home of His own choosing and making. The Pentecostal miracle is no displacement of Bethlehem's antecedent mystery, but this ever-widening and enduring mission of the Spirit is only to be taken as its own proper complement and last result. The very least then that can be said of this succeeding mystery is, that it is the perpetuation in the very bosom of the world's life of the coming of the Son of God in the flesh, under its own proper supernatural character and form.

This much is clearly evident from the constitution of the Church itself. It is not *autochthonic*; sprang not, in any sense or to any degree, out of the order of mere nature, but is wholly above it and distinct from it. Like its living Head and Founder, it is Divine-human. Not purely Divine, and so an order of



life and grace on the outside completely of humanity for whose benefit the whole economy itself was instituted; nor purely human, as standing wholly in the popular will, and thus of one order entirely with beneficial associations among men, a sort of *club*, having only a serious object in view, but resting on no superior authority, and challenging no greater respect. The elimination of the supernatural here, to any extent, vitiates the whole idea of the Church, and prepares the way for, and does itself at last issue in the baldest infidelity; as in the case of the Quakers, for instance, eliminating the sacramental (Divine), and making all stand in their *Inward Light* theory, while of a long time the whole system has been falling into the most rampant and undisguised Unitarianism, the denial *in toto* that Jesus Christ, God's Son, has come in the flesh. Here again we have the Divine in the human, the complex of the Divine Spirit and man's soul, needing and yearning for re-union with God, its only solid rest and comfort; the meeting-point of Divine grace and its human subject; a Divine organization standing indeed in the bosom of human society, but perpetuated and extended by Divine (sacramental) acts administered by consecrated human instrumentalities.

The old creation took its organized beginning in the Spirit's movement on the face of the formless deep; and, lo, order and beauty sprang out of that dark chaotic world (Gen. i. 2).<sup>\*</sup> The New Creation found its mysterious beginning in the Lord's miraculous conception, the overshadowing of the Virgin by the

---

<sup>\*</sup> "Spirit moved (*hovered lovingly*, cf. Deut. xxxii. 11) on the face of the waters." This passage clearly ascribes the animating process of creation to the Third Person of the Godhead—*τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ Κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν* of the Nicene Creed. Milton thus gives expression to the exact meaning:

"Thou from the first  
Wast present, and with mighty wings outspread  
Dove-like sat'st brooding on the vast abyss,  
And mad'st it pregnant."—*Book I.*

"Darkness profound  
Cover'd th' abyss; but on the wat'ry calm  
His brooding wings the Spirit of God outspread,  
And vital virtue infused and vital warmth  
Throughout the fluid mass."—*Book VII.*

Holy Ghost (St. Luke i. 35.) "The Logos becomes incarnate, but the Holy Spirit is employed in preparing Him a habitation in the womb of the Virgin Mary." On the day of Pentecost we have a like miraculous movement on the face of redeemed humanity; and, lo, in the dark world of sin and death, springs into actual being that kingdom of Life and Light, which shall be without limit and without end (Acts ii. 1-2). Here again the coming up from below, under its very highest form, is, of necessity, complemented and crowned by what comes down from above. This was a fresh Creational act from the Divine centre.\*

The result of this movement of the Spirit is a permanent work—the supernatural fact of the Church. Hitherto the Spirit had without measure dwelt in Christ. But now, with self-released freedom, He goes forth to an enlarged and ever-enlarging sphere of activity. The forces of redemption enter into the actual flow of history in an abiding and self-organizing form. The Spirit chooses and constitutes for Himself His home on earth, the one sphere of His life-giving operations, from its germinal beginning, in the one Baptism for the remission of sin, unto the Saint's full and final glorification in the Life-Everlasting. In the world since the day of Pentecost, yet is He not in it in any vague, diffusive form, like the atmosphere, like the wind, to which in the memorable words of Christ, He is compared, but only in this one particular, the mysteriousness of His operations, "lying beyond human consciousness." The Church is His perpetual home and abode, the Self-designated sphere of His continual presence and power among men.

Thus the Product and Home of the Spirit, it necessarily follows, that the Church is of the very essence of Christianity; a constituent part of the one great "Mystery of Godliness;"

---

\* "The Church is the evidence of the Holy Ghost's presence among men. Before the Incarnation He wrought unseen, and by no revealed law of His operations. Now He has assumed the Mystical Body as the *visible incorporation* of His presence, and the revealed channel of His grace. The Visible Church is a creation so evidently Divine, and its endowments are so visibly supernatural, that it can be referred to no cause, or origin below God." *Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*; by Archbishop Manning; p. 77.

nay, further still, the necessary corporate form under which alone that personal comprehension of "the powers of the world to come" may be said, if at all in any real way, to be actually present in the world through all time. Under this alone adequate and satisfactory view, the Church comes to be "the actual presence of the New Creation in Christ Jesus among men, comprising in itself all the supernatural powers which were introduced into the world by the Incarnation." And like that One supernatural fact, God's Personal approach to man *in* man, our conception of the Church only comports with the Divine reality itself, when it is apprehended and regarded as the sole organ of salvation where Christ, by the Spirit, continually approaches man with the reality of His grace, and man appropriates, in the full power of faith, what He gives in the sacraments of His own ordaining, themselves the very media thus of union and communion with Christ, the living Stock of the new humanity, being God's doings to man, not man's doings to God; God communicating of Himself, man appropriating.

All the offices of the Church partake necessarily of this same supernatural character. The ministry, for instance, is a *Christian* ministry. The office is such only because of its Divine origin, springing directly from the bosom of this new order of life and power starting in Christ. It could not possibly be such, if it started out from the human will merely, as expressed by congregational selection and appointment. No man can at will take up the office. It cannot be self-assumed, just as little as it can be congregationally conferred. Ministers are not in any such mechanical way, either the creatures or the representatives of the people. They are the representatives and ambassadors of Christ, and they are such only by His commission. The office thus stands in the Church by Divine authority; and no one can be rightly invested with its exercise, but in the full order of that same authority. Flowing out from Christ, the ripe fruit of His Resurrection-life (St. Matt. xxviii. 18-20; St. Mark xvi. 14, 15), His Ascension-gift (Eph. iv. 8, 11), and an essential part of the great Apos-

tolic Commission, ordination means something, and does something for the man thus solemnly set apart to this holy work.\*

And so the acts of the ministry. They are sacramental (Divine) acts; *God's dealings* with man. They carry with them the power, as they are wrought by the authority, of Christ. They are as though He were the direct personal actor. Hence, Baptism is a supernatural act, taking hold on the unseen world. It is a spiritual reality; not an empty form; not a Gnostic fiction; not a painted ship on painted water; but a soul washed and sanctified with the Holy Ghost, and received into the Ark of Christ's Church, that being steadfast in faith, joyful in hope, and rooted in charity, may so pass the waves of this troublesome world, as finally to come to the land of everlasting life.† As a sacramental (Divine) act, it does actually all it contemplates: seals, or conveys, as well as signifies the grace of Christ. It is the actual, not merely symbolical, ingrafting, or incorporation of the child of nature into Christ; his New Birth, the initial point of conjunction with the second Adam, the Head of the new humanity. Thus Christ, by the power of the Holy Ghost, is born in us, as previously He

---

\* Beecher profanely shows himself to be all wrong here, and wanting altogether in any proper sense of the holy office he bears among men. The theory on which "*clergymen are built*," which he holds to be the correct one, is that of *maternal ordination*! "It is held that a man may, moved by his own good sense, by his own moral aptitudes, become a teacher of moral ideas in a community. He is not endowed with any gifts, besides those which belong to any other man of mark or make. And the fact that he becomes a moral teacher gives him no special divine power. No special grace passes over into him, either by the touch of priestly hands, or through any long channel derived from the Apostles. He is what he is by the grace of God in the ordinance of his birth, and in the processes of his education—just that. And he derives just as much power as he can exert—not a bit more, and not a bit less. He is just like another man. Call up a layman that is his equal in intelligence, that is his equal in moral power, with his simplicity, sincerity, and directness, that layman is just as much as he is. There is nothing in ordination; there is nothing in the imposition of hands. *God's ordination lies in birth*. That is the grand ordination. \* \* \* *My mother ordained me*. God sent her to be my ordaining power!!!" *Beecher's Sermons. First Series, 1868-9, pp. 307, 312.* Could anything well be more impudent and profane! *Blasphemia execrabilis!*

† From the Baptismal prayer in the "Order of Worship." Translated by Luther in 1523, from an ancient Latin form, and from his "Baptismal Book," transferred to the English Prayer Book of 1549.

had been, by the same supernatural power, in the womb of the Virgin Mary (St. Luke i. 35), the Church serving perpetually the office of the Virgin-mother, \* according to St. Paul's full idea, "the Mother of us all" (Gal. iv. 26), and the Psalmist's antecedent one in reference even to ancient Zion (Ps. lxxxvii. 5), "It shall be said, This and that man was *born in her*."

And so the office of Holy Communion. It is the Self-communicating act of Christ. He gives Himself in it—His glorified corporeity. So He tells us: The bread is *His* body; the cup is *His* blood. To deny this is to empty this sacrament of all living, gracious significance. The Lord's own words, without gloss or comment, ought certainly to be sufficient here. In His anticipatory exposition of the Eucharist, this clear declaration as to its being a means of union between the receiver and Himself occurs: "He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him" (St. John vi. 56). St. Paul alike explicitly affirms it to be the actual communication of Christ Himself; and this, not in a figure, but in His deepest substance. The interrogative form in which it is put, is only the fullest and strongest affirmation of the truth: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion, *i. e.* communication (*κοινωνία*) of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion (*κοινωνία*, again,) of the body of Christ" (1 Cor. x. 16) ?

The Divine Presence in the Eucharist depends not upon the communicant's state of mind. It is an independent fact. Not by human thought, or memory, or will, or faith, any mere mental exercise, is Christ put into the Eucharistical transaction. He is there by the sacramental (Divine) act of consecration, through the Spirit. Faith is only the soul's eye-sight by which His presence is realized, and the full benefits of His grace, actually at hand, individually secured. Not the Divine Presence, but only the actual benefit of the Holy Communion is mediated by faith. "The benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that Holy Sacrament;

---

\* On Eph. v. 30-32, Alford makes this comment, "He is the *ἀνδρων* in the Apostle's view here, the Church is the *γυνή*."

for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink His blood; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us. The union thus spoken of in such solemn tones is not a mental conformity of opinion, sympathy, and will, although these necessarily result from it, but it is a real and actual incorporation of the spiritual portion of man's nature with the Sacramental Body and Blood of Christ, and hence with Christ Himself. Such an act of incorporation is initiated in Holy Baptism, by which the foundation of spiritual life is laid; and it is ever being renewed, strengthened and perfected in the Holy Communion by which the superstructure of spiritual life is built up in the soul."\*

Why there should be such an outcry against the sacraments actually doing and conveying what they purpose, it is hard to understand. Are they not *mysteries*?† and do they not stand on the same level precisely with the great "Mystery of Godliness;"—the ground of all subsequent mysteries in the same supernatural order of grace—and of which they are necessary constituent parts? We cannot withhold these other sentences from the book just cited: "When a perfect and unimpeded spiritual intercourse was to be renewed between the Creator and His fallen creatures, God, who 'is a Spirit,' took upon Him a bodily nature, and by means of it became a Mediator, through

\* *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer, Edited by Rev. John Henry Blunt, F.S.A., 1869, p. 157.*

† *Μυστήριον* always carries along with it the idea of something hidden from man until God reveals it; "something into which one must be initiated, something of itself not obvious and above human insight" (Robinson). St. Paul uses the word strictly in the sense of "something passing human comprehension, but revealed as a portion of the Divine dealings." Thus the mysterious relation of Christ to His Church, of which marriage is but a faint resemblance, is designated by the word *μυστήριον*. And though not a Sacrament in the strict sense, as contended by the Romanists, yet the very fact of its being compared by an inspired writer to such a mystery, gives to marriage a sacramental character, and places it on holier and higher grounds than is generally admitted. And the use of this same word, in speaking of the Incarnation and the Sacraments, respectively, shows that, in the mind of the early Church, the latter, alike with the former, belonged to the *mysteries* of our Christian Faith. Thus Isidore: "These (Baptism and Holy Communion) are called Sacraments, because under the covering of bodily things the power of God secretly worketh the salvation, which lieth in them. Whence from their hidden and sacred virtues they are called Sacraments." Again, "It is called in Greek *μυστήριον*, a mystery, because it hath a *secret and hidden dispensation*."

whom that intercourse could be originated and maintained. For the particular application, also, of the benefits of His mediation, Christ ordained Sacraments, which are outward and visible signs endowed with the capacity of conveying inward and spiritual grace to the soul through the organs of the body." With this correspond in full these words from the answer to *Ques. 75*, of the Heidelberg Catechism: "That He feeds and nourishes my soul to everlasting life, with His crucified Body and shed Blood, as assuredly as I receive from the hands of the minister and taste with my mouth the bread and cup of the Lord, as certain signs of the Body and Blood of Christ." And to this we yet add these words from the Post-Communion prayer in the Order of Worship: \* \* \* "in vouchsafing to feed us, through these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; assuring us thereby that we are very members incorporate in the Mystical Body of Thy Son."

We have not space now to enter further into this wide branch of the subject. Nor, considering all that has been said, is this deemed necessary. It will form a proper conclusion to the article to indicate, briefly, the relation of the Creed to the whole subject of Organic Redemption.

The Apostles' Creed, the archetypal symbol of Christian truth, corresponds throughout with this organic order and sense of Christianity. Every earnest mind, coming to it with any conscientious study, must see that the articles stand in each other as constituent, consecutive and necessary parts, like branches in the same grand trunk. The progress made here, is not that of isolated and separate truths accumulated and added, one by one, but inherent necessity, one article making room for the succeeding one, and necessitating it for its own completion and proper sense. Accordingly, its progress is not that of *logical* necessity merely. That, indeed; but far more also than that, the progress of *organic structure and outgrowth*. It is itself ruled by the antecedent objective progress of the Gospel. And just because it is itself thus inflexibly regulated, in the arrangement of its own articles, by this antecedent order



of supernatural facts, it is for Christian faith, in all times, formative in its character, the old but ever fresh *regula fidei*.

The Creed is thus an organic unit; grew, was not made. It gives us not only the true order, but the wholeness of faith. The articles are not separable nor transposable at the arbitrary will and judgment of the individual. Each, and each in the very order it there takes, is necessary to the integrity of the whole. No man, without marring and seriously mutilating its consecutive scheme, can drop out a single article, as for instance, that of the Church, or give it some other place. Any hand laid, in any such Vandal style, upon it, destroys not only the harmony of its parts, but just as effectually also its unity and completeness. The wholeness of faith requires each article, and each article in the place precisely where it comes forward in the Creed itself. The one flowing essentially out from the one immediately preceding, they have come to stand organically and indissolubly connected. In the briefest possible compass and the proper consecutive order, the Creed gives us, from first to last, the *whole range* of the Christian Redemption.

The doctrine of the Church, it follows, is here in no merely loose and incidental way. It finds its place just where it does, because the whole manward movement of God's grace had antecedently taken precisely this order and form. The sublime order of fact makes here the order of faith. In this particular the order of faith is not ruled, it is easily seen, by mere logical necessity, but a necessity itself anterior to and deeper than mere logic—the organic onflow of Christianity, the objective historical progress of the Gospel itself. It stands thus itself the constituent connecting link between all that goes before and all that follows after, onward to the Life Everlasting. It is not, therefore, to be dropped out as a thing of small moment in itself, and something which may readily be dispensed with altogether, without any material damage to individual spiritual interests. He who says so, has little sense of the necessary order of salvation, as brought before us in the Divine word itself.

Finding its place in the Creed, as a constituent part of the "Mystery of Godliness," the Church challenges our faith equally along with the several articles which, in their due order

and process, had gone before. Itself a mystery, it stands along side of that Mystery of mysteries, the Son of God come in the flesh, as an object of faith. Let no one then persist in the slander, that in the Church-system there is no room for faith. Among subjective emotions faith has its own proper and necessary office. It is, in Divine realities, the apprehending and appropriating power of the soul. But faith also has its own full, round order. It is not faith in God alone, nor Christ alone, nor the Holy Ghost alone, but faith also in the Church, its mediating and grace-communicating office. It commences: I believe in God the Father; in Christ, His Divine-human person, following the whole order of His tried but triumphant life; in the Holy Ghost, His office and work, constituting the world of grace; in the Church, the actual presence of that Higher Life, and its mediating order; in the forgiveness of sin as flowing necessarily through the Church, and not a purely notional thing; in the resurrection of the body, the outworking and last result of that Higher Life; and ending gloriously with the Life Everlasting, the believer's free, full, uninterrupted and face to face communion with God.

Not a single article can here be eliminated, and just as little as any, the article of the Holy Catholic Church. Let no one then dream of salvation in its repudiation and contempt. No more than the others, is it to be brought to the bar of mere reason and common sense. With them, it too, is an object of faith. And in the great matter of justification itself, faith, shorn of its proper contents, is comparatively weak and worthless, if it take not the order and form prescribed in that venerated symbol of the primitive Church, containing "THE ARTICLES OF OUR CATHOLIC UNDOUBTED CHRISTIAN FAITH."

We had intended, in the way of addenda, giving some quotations from the most eminent of the primitive Fathers, with one voice emphasizing the objective, sacramental and positive side, showing that, from Clement of Rome (A. D. 100), whose idea of the Church is that of organic life, "each member of the body discharging the functions assigned it by the Head,"\*

---

\* *First Epistle, chapters 37, 42.*

onward, by definitions becoming ever fuller; clearer and stronger, this organic, objective and historical conception of Christianity was the original and uniform sense. But we must abandon, for the present at least, all purpose of the kind. Our article has already exceeded the limits originally designed.

---

## ART. II.—ORIGEN.

BY ALEX. HARRIS, LANCASTER, PA.

THE speculative systems of antiquity convinced the reason of the world, that the heathen religions of Greece and Rome deduced their origin from fabulous sources. Only the uneducated remained any longer believers in a system of myths that had been battled from the days of the Sophists, and which had completely received its death-blows in the dialectics of the Stoic, Platonic and Peripatetic schools. That death is an eternal sleep was promulgated by Epicurus and his followers, and the learned had come very generally to accept this as a truth that, though melancholy, was nevertheless the fate of man. With Pythagoras and Plato a metempsychosis was substituted, little accordant however with the earnest longings of the mind for future existence; but the remorseless logic of these philosophers would not permit that to live in the future that had not existed in the past. If the soul is to exist to eternity it must, say they, have existed from eternity, and be a part of the great uncreated soul which pervades everything and underlies all existence. Out of this eternal soul which they styled God, human souls flowed forth and united with their respective bodies, and upon the dissolution of the body would again be absorbed into the soul-unity of existence. Individual consciousness, according to the teachings of this heartless theory, was forever blotted out; the frail bark of humanity simply emptied its soul contents into the primeval ocean of spirit, and the life of man became, therefore, but a flicker, and future existence for him but a dream. Religion in fine under such teaching be-

came a scoff and a by-word, not only in the schools of the philosophers, but among all classes where investigation had penetrated; and the pens of a Lucretius and a Lucian were freely employed in scathing the superstitions of the vulgar, and in bringing the common, illiterate opinions into the most general disrepute and ridicule.

The result reached, however, by all the different conflicting philosophic schools, was but simple negation, and they were far from the attainment of that objective truth which is necessary to satisfy the heart of humanity. This was reserved for the Prophet of Galilee, who came in the fullness of time to lay the foundations of a religion that should claim the allegiance of the learned as well as the unlearned. This religion emanating, however, from Judea, a country, in which in the estimation of heathen Sages, all superstition centered, was not calculated speedily to attract men firmly fixed in their systems of thinking, and who regarded everything savoring of the supernatural as tainted with priestcraft and imposture.

The expanding consciousness of Judaism and Platonism met in Philo, the Jew, about the period of the proclamation of the new dispensation, and the underlying truths that had existed in the world in all systems of belief, whether human or revealed, were reconciled and given forth by this Jewish philosopher for the first time, and then it began to be perceived that the aspirations of mankind and the truths of the Jewish system harmonized. The *Wisdom* of Solomon and the *Logos* of Philo, found an accord in the enlightened conceptions of the Alexandrian Philo. This philosopher, deeply imbued in the speculations of Plato, and also thoroughly read in the different branches of the Jewish theology, recognized in the book of Revelation a higher truth than the mere letter of Scripture, and that this truth had been imparted to human consciousness by the Logos, or the divine reason that existed in the bosom of the Creator before all ages. Greek philosophy was now for the first time penetrated, and it was perceived that instead of its results proving destructive to religion, a germ existed in it that but required a proper soil in order to its growth. A new leaven was cast into

the basin of reasoning intellect, and a fermentation began that was destined ere long to purify the whole philosophic world. A divine philosopher, the man of Nazareth, had appeared and given utterance to truths that the wisest Sages of antiquity had but faintly surmised, and now instead of indiscriminately consigning the new doctrines to the regions of the fabulous, as they had done with the heathen myths, many dialecticians began to inquire into all the mysteries of a system that so approved itself to their reason.

One of the earliest advances on the part of the reasoning mind was that made by the Gnostics, who are with great propriety termed the speculative philosophers of their time. These are believed by many to have started up as early as the apostolic age, their name seemingly being imported in certain expressions of the apostle Paul in his epistle to Timothy, and also in that to the Colossians. It was but simply, however, a transfer to the vocabulary and parties of the Church of that distinction that had long obtained in the world of Greek thought; the distinction between the *Gnosis*, the religion of knowledge, and the faith of the multitude, (πίστις τῶν πολλῶν.) In this aspect Christianity was already recognized as a new system of philosophy which was one step already towards its establishment in the estimation of the learned. These were attracted towards it from this view of it, and some of them when they became fully indoctrinated into its precepts, laid the more and more their philosophical conceptions of it aside.

But the great task of moulding the system of Christianity into an organized and philosophical form; of educating the Greek intellect up to the fullest conception of it as a revelation from on high; and of making the truths of faith and reason harmonize, was reserved for the Alexandrian school of Christians represented in Justin Martyr, Clement and Origen. The skeptical Greek philosophy could alone be combated by those versed in Grecian learning, but, that this was successfully accomplished seems fully demonstrated in the developments of history. The attitude maintained by the greatest of the Alexandrian teachers, Origen, in the gigantic contest between faith and reason we propose at present somewhat to unfold.

In order to form a correct estimate of this great teacher, the place in which he was born, the age in which he lived, and the prevailing tone of opinion must be taken into consideration. Alexandria was at that time the principal seat of Grecian culture. In this city were by far more of mere learning and knowledge than had ever before been in Greece, but much less genius. The Alexandrian scholars were mostly philologists and eclectic philosophers, and their philosophy a compound of the Oriental and Grecian systems had more surface than depth. The theosophic and Gnostic mode of speculation was teaching many Pagans to contemplate subjects kindred with some of the more mysterious truths of revelation. Stoicism, and the system of Pythagoras as modified by Platonism were prevalent at Alexandria, in both of which sensual delights were despised, and self-denial diligently inculcated. Judaism in this city had long before assumed the same ascetic form, and the Oriental systems of philosophy that were then zealously taught contained within them the fundamental principles of Brahminism.

Egypt at this time was a second India, in which Pagans, Jews, and Christians were nearly agreed in sentiment with respect to the practice of austerities. It was not difficult to make the words of Christ and His Apostles in certain passages of Scripture, if literally interpreted, or rather perverted, support such a theory of virtue. Maimonides, the Jew, had there taught "that he who would understand the law, must live on bread and water, sleep on the ground, lead an austere life, and devote all his time to study."

In the midst of such opinions Origen enters the arena on the side of revelation. This, the greatest intellect who had as yet been arrayed on the side of the Christians, stood almost isolated and alone in the midst of systems of speculation that had for centuries enchained the mind and reason of the world. It is not to be expected that we shall in him be able to present a Church advocate as genuine and free from the dross of antiquity as later ages produced. The Christian consciousness of the third century was but in a process of development, and it required more than one age to round it into a symmetrical con-

tour freed from all the entanglements of error and sophistry. Remembering the age in which Origen lived, as also his surroundings, it may well be admitted that he performed, with all his mistakes and short-comings, a noble part in the construction and solidification of the Christian Church, and to him is justly due the credit of being styled the father and founder of Church theology. But for Origen and the Alexandrian school, it is exceedingly problematical if the Church should at least for long ages have succeeded in establishing in an enlightened public opinion the fundamental principles of revelation. It might of course have lingered amongst the illiterate, and dragged on its existence in the midst of persecutions and contempt; but its full enthronement upon the seat of human reason was chiefly brought about by the labors of Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, his great disciple.

Justin Martyr was the harbinger of a pure Christian philosophy. In his writings we meet with noble suggestions, especially in his idea of the *λογος σπερματικός*, which shows a perception of the unity of all philosophic truth. With him, however, Christianity was rather regarded as a fuller revelation of doctrines already known in part by the ancient mind than of a central supernatural fact of redemption. He was the first to develop the idea of the Logos as the ground of the prologue to the Gospel of John. But it is when we turn from the cruder reasonings of Justin to the works of Clement and Origen, that the richest development is perceived. Filled with the spirit of Christian faith, while immersed in the atmosphere of Greek genius, these writings are a mine of precious metal as yet in the ore, but piercing the soil everywhere with broad veins, and the very sand heavy and shining with grains of golden wisdom. The works of these authors are, however, simply what Clement called his *Stromata*, materials for a doctrinal edifice. It is not their views on particular doctrines, but the fundamental ground they assumed as regards the relation of Christianity to reason, by which their importance is to be estimated.

While Justin Martyr, and Clement of Alexandria were originally Platonic philosophers who embraced Christianity as



a new light sent forth in the world, Origen on the contrary was born of Christian parents who carefully instructed him in the Holy Scriptures, and caused him to commit daily portions of them to memory. In his youth he evinced his intellectual superiority by frequently propounding to his father questions as regards the hidden sense of Scripture, which Leonidas being unable to solve, urged him that he content himself with the words without so much searching after hidden signification. The father, although seemingly desirous of checking the inquiring disposition of his son, was anything but displeased therewith, as it is related of him, that oft sitting beside his sleeping boy, he would reverently kiss his bared bosom as being a chosen temple of the Holy Ghost. The pious instruction of home in his case was of lasting effect, and acted in after years to a certain extent as a check on the too intellectual tendency of his later studies. He was at first a pupil of Clement, who was head of the catechetical establishment at Alexandria, and afterwards he entered the philosophical school of the founder of Eclecticism, Ammonias Sacras, which was frequented both by Pagans and Christians. In his early years the religion of the heart was uppermost with Origen, and the system of the ascetics greatly influenced his actions. Supposing that the gospels and epistles coincided with the prevalent notions then current among different parties at Alexandria, as above stated, as regards ascetic observances, he followed these instructions to the letter. He contented himself with one coat, went barefooted for several years, and studiously avoided the use of wine or anything else that would minister to sensual desire. After the laborious task of the day, which he as a teacher performed, he was in the habit of spending most of the night in the study of the Scriptures, and then threw himself upon the floor and indulged in a brief repose. The weight he attached to the literal import of Scripture may be inferred from the indiscreet act of self-mutilation, *more Sacerdotum Cybelles*.\* Of this

---

\* The correctness of this fact has recently been called in question by Schnitzer in his *Origenes ueber die grundlehren der glaubenswissenschaft*, and also by Ferdinand Christian Baur, the celebrated founder of the Tubingen School of German Biblical criticism.

false step he in after years used the following language. "I who once knew Christ the Divine Logos, only according to the flesh and the letter, now no longer know Him so." As somewhat explanatory of an act that seems almost incredible, let it be borne in mind that a theory of morals and practice obtained at Alexandria, that can fully account for the truth of the alleged self-mutilation. To such an extent did the practice referred to prevail near the end of the second century, that the Sovereign of Edessa was obliged to prohibit it by law. For the same reason did the Apostolic Canons and the Council of Nice exclude eunuchs from the gospel ministry. Two well known classes of heathen priests, *erant castrati*. Ministers of state were often such, and in the time of Septimus Severus a single courtier had a hundred eunuchs in his house. Even at a later period Chrysostom had occasion openly to oppose and condemn this custom.

It is not within the scope of the present article to follow Origen through the meandering scenes of a busy life, but simply to present the leading features that characterize him as a doctrinal expounder of the Church. As head of the catechetical school of Alexandria, he attracted auditors from all quarters. Many of his hearers being Heretics and Pagans of philosophical education, entered into discussion with him on religious topics, and he was as a consequence necessitated to study thoroughly the various systems of those who differed with him, in order to be able to give an answer for the faith that he held. In this manner was it that he became so conversant with the tenets and opinions of the different philosophical systems of the day.

But it is rather as a voluminous writer, collector and expounder of Sacred Scripture, that Origen stands pre-eminent. In this sphere, he was deserving of the surname *Adamantius* which was conferred upon him on account of his invincible perseverance and patience in his labors. The execution of the Hexapla was one of the great labors of this Church teacher, that laid the foundation for a critical study of the sacred text, and this work served as the arsenal from which he and his followers

obtained their weapons in their controversies with the heretics and the heathen philosophers.\* His two most celebrated works are his *Contra Celsum*, and *De Principiis*, the latter of which exists only in the Latin translation of Rufinus.† His commentaries on the Scriptures evince great research and wonderful ingenuity. The other writings of Origen consisted of *Scholia* and *Homilies*, the former of which are all lost, and a great part of the latter as likewise a considerable portion of his commentaries. The translator of the most of his extant writings, Rufinus, was unfortunately one of an order to whom the "nec verbum verbo curabis reddere," was an injunction wholly superfluous. We are very greatly at his mercy. In his prologue to his version of Origen's Commentary on the Romans, he piques himself as having supplied many deficiencies in the *Homilies*, which he says were delivered by Origen, "with a view rather to edification than to full explanation of the text," and on his having completely discussed many points upon which Origen had merely touched. Thus, in the absence of the original Greek, we cannot say whether we are reading the words of Origen or those of his too officious admirer. And yet while some have been ready on this account to condemn nearly all these versions as spurious, this opinion is not sustained by a sound criticism. Origen wielded, according to the testimony of ancient authors, a very prolific pen. Epiphanius and Rufinus state that he wrote six thousand volumes, a number utterly incredible did we not remember that the separate *homilies* and parts of the larger treatises were in that age reckoned as a volume.

Again, in endeavoring to form an estimate of the opinions of Origen, it becomes necessary to inquire into the forms of thinking that prevailed in the philosophical schools of his time. The double system that he made use of, the *esoteric* and the *exoteric*,

---

\* Montfaucon imagined this work to have consisted of sixty large volumes. It is believed to have perished with the library of Cesarea in the year 653. Nothing of it remains save some fragments.

† The text is believed to have been corrupted by this translator, and it is uncertain, therefore, whether the real opinions of Origen are obtained from it or not.

should constantly be kept in view as some explanation for many inconsistencies that appear in his writings. This form of instruction was no invention of Origen. It had been current amongst the ancient Druids and Egyptians, and was also adopted by Pythagoras and Plato, and the Greek philosophers in general. The great truths of the Gospel he taught plainly to the many; but very different was the exposition of such truths with which he favored the initiated and the learned few. The elaborate treatise abounded accordingly in philosophical speculation, and in hazardous attempts to explain the inexplicable. It was from works of this character principally, that his enemies derived matter for their charges against him; while his partisans have resorted in his defence to his exoterical writings. Those who have assailed him have too often forgotten the diffidence with which he put forth his opinions on more abstruse and difficult points, delivering them commonly as so much hypothesis, as views which he desired others after examination to adopt or reject as they saw proper, and which he himself was ready to abandon at any time, for such as should be found more in accordance with truth. Without, therefore, constantly bearing in mind the *duplex instructio*, it would seem as if the lines of Horace were applicable to him.

Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?  
Quod petit, spernit, repetit quod nuper omisit,  
Diruit, ædificat, mutat quadrata rotundis.

It may be too harsh to assert of Origen, that in his explanations of Scripture, he entirely expounded it esoterically and exoterically as a Jamblicus would explain the myths of the Pagan mythology. In his estimate, all Scripture was a letting down of the infinitely exalted, heavenly Spirit to human form, or rather that it was a humanization of the divine Logos. The highest problem therefore for him, in the exposition of Scripture, was to transfuse the gospel of spirit, and to endeavor to rise from the earthly appearance of sense into the gospel of the incarnate Word and to spiritual fellowship with Him. An analogy existed, as he thought, between Holy Scripture, as the work of God, and the whole creation as proceeding from the same omnipotent archi-

tect. The following from his pen clearly expresses this: "We ought not to be surprised, if the superhuman character of the thought does not to the unlearned, immediately become obvious in every text of Scripture; for even in the works of Providence which embrace the world, some things reveal themselves as such works of Providence in the clearest manner, whilst others are so obscure as to leave room for the admission of unbelief in a God who governs all with inexpressible wisdom and power. But as we do not quarrel with Providence on account of those things we do not understand, if we are but truly convinced that such a providence exists; so neither can we doubt the divinity which pervades the whole body of the Sacred Scriptures, because our weakness is incompetent to trace in each declaration that hidden glory of the doctrines which is veiled under the simplicity of the expression; for we have the treasure in earthen vessels."

The literal sense of Scripture was never fully abandoned by Origen; yet after his passage over from the *Pistis* to the *Gnosis* the letter of Scripture was of little consequence in his estimation. There were many passages of the Sacred text, the literal sense of which in his estimation could not be defended. Even, in his view, the reformation of life was inferior to the higher speculative aims, and was, as he believed, simply designed for the mass of believers who were as yet incapable of any thing higher. Interpretation of Scripture to carry out its noblest object must aim, above all else, to communicate spiritual truths to the spiritual men who were competent to understand them, the Gnostici. Those truths related as he supposed to the following questions: "*First*, concerning God, what is the nature of His only begotten Son, and in what sense is He the Son of God; for what reason did He condescend to enter into human nature, what effect resulted from this act, and on what beings, and when does it reach them? *Secondly*, concerning the higher kinds of rational beings who have fallen from the state of bliss, and of the causes of their fall; of the different kinds of souls, and whence their differences arise? *Thirdly*, concerning the world, what it is, and why created; whence the existence of so

much evil on the earth, and whether it exists on the earth only, or is to be found in other parts of creation?"

All history and all legislation with regard to merely earthly relations, he therefore explained as being the symbolical veil of a higher history of the spiritual world, and of higher laws relating to a spiritual life. Thus the higher and the subordinate ends of Scripture were united; the higher truths were veiled under a letter suited for the instruction of the multitude. "The mass of genuine and simple believers," says Origen, "testify to the utility, even of this inferior understanding of the Scriptures." Besides these two senses of Scripture, Origen held another, intermediate between the two former, and suited to the capacity of those who had not as yet attained to the highest contemplation of the spirit. In this three-fold sense of Scripture, he regarded it as in a Platonic view a man. For as man, according to Plato, consists of three parts, a body, a sensitive soul, and a rational soul; so also the Sacred books have a triple sense, a body or a historical and grammatical sense, a soul or a moral sense, and lastly a spirit or a mystical and spiritual sense.

The allegorical method of explaining Scripture by Origen, which had been used by Philo the Jew, and Clement of Alexandria, was also made use of by Ammonius, the founder of Neo Platonism, and his followers in their interpretation of Homer, Hesiod, and the entire history of the Pagan deities. By the one, allegory was applied to the Scripture, and by the other, to the interpretation of the heathen myths. Both derived it from the same philosophical sources. The leading object that Ammonius had in view was, to bring about a reconciliation of all the philosophical sects, Greeks as well as Barbarians, and also a harmony of all religions, even of Christianity and Heathenism. By means of allegory he attempted to bring all sects into complete harmony, by showing that only minor differences existed between them, and that in the main they agreed. From the whole he essayed to educe one perfect system. Origen was ready to acquiesce in this view of Ammonius, his preceptor, in accepting one philosophy as the vehicle of truth, but

regarded the Scriptures as containing the most perfect compend of that philosophy. Ammonius and the Neo Platonists, in recognizing truth as lying at the bottom of all systems of philosophy and religion, became in a sense co-laborers, so to speak with Origen and the Alexandrian Christians in the development of the consciousness and reason into a preparative state of receptivity of the gospel of revelation. A wonderful congruity of sentiment from whatever source derived, is perceived to exist between the sentiments of the Neo Platonic philosophers and many truths of Christianity. This is particularly so as regards matters touching the Deity, the human soul, the world, the trinity of persons in the Godhead, good and bad angels, and the like, as well as their different maxims and precepts relating to piety and morals. The writings of Hierocles on the golden verses of Pythagoras, those of Simplicius, Jamblichus, and others are replete with Christian phrases and expressions.

But still, despite all eclectic preparation, a great work remained for Origen. He it was who first laid down clearly the position, new to the age, that the Divine Revelation was the distinct source of all truths which concerned redemption; and that while speculative reason might range freely beyond the circle of these truths, within this it must bow in faith, and from this centre build up a Christian philosophy and ethics. This was a position opposed on the one side to an empiricism of the mere letter, and on the other to the idealism which destroyed it. This was the corner-stone of all legitimate Christian science, and this foundation laid by Origen, has been the basis upon which all subsequent Christian philosophy has been reared. The rubbish and dross of his speculative opinions were cast aside; the gold of his teaching was refined in a later and better wisdom.

Standing upon the same philosophical height with the Neo Platonists, but upon advanced religious ground, Origen could point out to them in the Scriptures all they possessed and much more. He could refer to the perfect satisfaction with which the Christians rested in the faith of the Church; and as they themselves accepted the Logos of Plato as the revelator



of truth; this their divine reason had for the Christians actually descended and given a veritable revelation, and one that far transcended the illuminations of the philosopher of the Academy or any of his followers.

The peculiarities of opinions entertained by Origen will not appear so remarkable, when viewed in the light of the age in which he lived. His view as to the connection between philosophy and religion lies at the base of his entire system. Philosophy, when elevated above the grosser forms of error with which it had long been connected, might be advantageously admitted to a union with Christianity. The doctrines of Christianity, though superior to those of any philosophical systems, might yet be explained upon the principles of philosophy. Such was the instruction that had fallen from the lips of Clement, his preceptor.

Philosophy is as important to Christian theology, says Origen, as geometry, music, grammar, rhetoric, and astronomy are to philosophy. This he says in reference to the true philosophy, that which had been purified from the corruptions and figments of sects; and in this light he viewed the system of Ammonius which after correcting a few points he endeavored to harmonize with Christianity. Therefore, as the sciences above named are useful to the philosopher for sharpening his acumen, strengthening his reasoning powers, and enabling him to comprehend and arrange more perfectly the precepts of philosophy; so did he suppose philosophy to be useful to the theologian in enabling him to acquire just views of Christian doctrines, and to give just expositions of them. On the agreement of philosophy with the divine law, he says: "*Multi enim philosophorum unum esse Deum, qui cuncta creaverit, scribunt. In hoc consentiunt legi Dei. Aliquantum etiam hoc addiderunt, quod Deus cuncta per verbum suum et fecerit et regat, et verbum Dei sit, quo cuncta moderentur. In hoc non solum legi, sed etiam Evangelii consona scribunt. Moralis vero et physica, quæ dicitur, philosophia pœne omnia quæ nostra sunt sentiunt.*"

The views of Origen on these points will be better understood if we remember his subdivisions of philosophy into three

parts, *logic*, *physics* and *ethics*, or into rational, natural, and moral philosophy. As he considered that the philosophers agreed perfectly with the Christians in physics and ethics, or in natural and moral philosophy, the only disagreement that could arise, in his opinion, related to logic or rational philosophy. But we are not to understand by rational philosophy in the sense of Origen what this term now imports; but rather *ontology*, or our *pneumatology*, *cosmogony*, and *natural theology*. This his rational philosophy, as explained by the philosophical sects, according to his judgment, in many particulars conflicted with the Christian religion; but if once freed from the error and false opinions of the sects and conformed to the truth, nothing in it would be found inconsistent with Christianity. This his true rational philosophy was what he had learned in the school of Ammonius Saccas, and which he desired to associate with Christian truth and from the compound produce a perfect system.

Origen conceived that there were many things that had not been clearly revealed, and on such points he held that the mind was free to reason, and if possible to illuminate by the principles of true philosophy. That the world at a certain time began to exist, and would at a certain time perish, is clearly revealed; but why it was created, and for what reason it will be destroyed, he claimed that the doctrines of philosophy should be examined to see what light they throw upon these questions. An apostacy of mankind was also clear in the light of Scripture, not so the reasons of this, and must therefore be investigated, and so as to many other points. Origen believed that the light afforded by philosophy would enable the investigator to see the congruity that existed between reason and revelation. In his explanation of religious truth, he generally betook himself first to reason and philosophy, and then recurs to the Sacred Oracles, in order to elucidate by them his explanations and to confirm his conjectures by some similitude; but sometimes he makes philosophy his sole guide without reference to Scripture. The former course was adopted when the *cause* of things was to be investigated; and the latter when the

*modes* or *forms* are discussed. For the investigation of *causes* or the *reasons* of revelation, he held that an illumination of the Holy Spirit was needed. None can succeed in this as he asserted, "except those who have acquired the more excellent gifts of the Holy Spirit, and especially have obtained through the Holy Spirit the gifts of language, of wisdom and knowledge." The force of this declaration can only be understood by those who are familiar with the theology of the ancient Christians. It was an established opinion among them, that the import of the literal words of Scripture was plain and easy to be understood; but that for the comprehension of what Origen terms *Spiritualium intelligentiam*, the remote sense, only would the illumination of the Spirit suffice. This gift that would reveal the hidden mysteries of the Sacred books, they called the gift of wisdom and knowledge, and hence they were accustomed to use the word knowledge, *γνῶσις*, to designate the mystical sense of Scripture.

It was the supposed attainment of this mystical hidden sense (that underlay all philosophy and religion) which gave birth to the various systems of gnostics that rose up in the bosom of the early Church, and corrupted the truths of revelation by the medley of strange opinions that they had brought with them from the Platonic, Pythagoric, Oriental, and Cabalistic systems of philosophy. The period of which we now speak may properly be termed the great chaos in the opinions of the old world; the stupendous revolution that upturned all former systems of philosophy throughout the civilized world; and the period in short when the conquering hosts of Christianity, led by a Clement, and an Origen, were carrying forward the banner of faith over all the barriers of reason and false science, were overthrowing superstition and sophistry, were planting the escutcheon of the Cross upon the strong ramparts of delusion and error, and when the strife was over busied themselves in gathering into the fold of the meek and lowly the deluded followers of perverted reason.

Perhaps in no age that the world has ever seen, was there such a farrago of conflicting and confused opinions as during the

third century. A perfect enthusiasm, and rage, a madness prevailed in the pursuit of philosophy. Such a variety of conflicting sects met together upon one and the same arena in Alexandria. In this city there was a perfect uproar of philosophy; every thing intellectual, every thing moral, took this turn. There was exceedingly little light, and what it was rapidly disappearing. The culminating point of light in the world's intellect was reached in Plato, and every step from him was a retrograde one. Every new mixture in the cauldron of Alexandrian eclecticism, produced only a thicker scum of error. Every turn in the medley of philosophical opinions only made "confusion worse confounded." Yet, philosophy was the fashion; it was learning, it was education, it was refinement, it was *γνώσις*, the knowledge of God and of Creation, of good and evil, and every religionist must be a philosopher. The world in a word had become drunk with philosophy.

It was in the midst of this boiling chaos of society, this fermentation of the world's opinions that Origen rose up as the great advocate of revelation and the Holy Scriptures. Surrounded as he was by the Gnostics and other sects, his great aim was in opposition to these to reconcile Christianity with reason, and make it acceptable to the philosophic mind. Most of Origen's peculiar opinions may be traced to this aim on his part, and it was an undertaking that in his age no ordinary learning or intellect was adequate to. The philosophical scheme which Origen adopted required him, as he believed, to concede large portions of the Scriptures to be fabulous. Whenever, therefore, any statement occurs in the Sacred writings that afforded the enemies of Christianity a ground for cavilling, he denied its literal interpretation, and converted it into a moral or mystical fable. Large portions of the Old Testament that gave offence to the Gnostics, received in his teaching such an interpretation as disarmed these wily cavillers. He likewise regarded a large part of the New Testament as fabulous, and held that recondite mysteries were merely intended to be conveyed, which were couched beneath the letter. He acknowledged that the whole history of the four gospels is full of state-

ments, either false or contradictory to each other; and that no way is left to defend the authority and divine origin of these books, but by having recourse to his mode of interpretation.

Origen and the Alexandrian Christians did not regard the Gnostics as a set of willful impostors and perverse corrupters of the truth as they were stamped by the leaders of the western Church; but they sympathized with them so far as to allow that real mental wants had given birth to many of their theories. They strove accordingly to satisfy the cravings of the *pseudo-gnosis* by the substitution of a *gnosis* properly so-called. They accordingly granted that the faith of ordinary Christians was in many points a popular adaptation, rather than a scientific expression of the truth, and that beneath the terminology of the Church there existed a richer vein of doctrines which philosophers, and they alone, could thoroughly appreciate. Such thoughts colored all the streams of the Alexandrian theology, and especially the views of Clement, Origen, and their disciples with regard to the position of the heathen world. No absolute boundary was drawn between the Christian Church and philosophy; it was conceived as standing in the same relation to the Heathen, as the law of Moses to the Jews, and both as it were pedagogues to prepare men for the Christian school. The gospel was infinitely raised above all previous systems, and was made as complementary to and superseding them; but their profound anxiety to place it upon a broader basis and in more intelligible connection with history, as well as with the literary and artistic culture of mankind at large, impelled them to approximate as closely as the nature of the case admitted to the position of the *pseudo-gnostics*.

From what has been already adduced, it could scarcely be expected that Origen with his free method of interpretation was able to regard the Scriptures as inspired in the modern acceptance of this term. "In general," says Gieseler, *Dogmengeschichte*, p. 98, "Origen appears to understand by inspiration, not the pouring in of foreign thoughts, but an exaltation of the powers of the soul, whereby prophets and apostles were elevated to the knowledge of the truth; and this view was adhered to in the school of Origen."

Origen conceived that God was the original source of all existence, a pure spirit without mixture of matter, a being without beginning or end, and the fountain of all life and blessing. Between this self-subsistent source or fountain of being and creation, was the *logos* or divine reason, as the intermediate link through which all communication of life proceeds. This superior Being reveals Himself by means of the *logos* to all other existences and to them all is the source of truth. All ranks of reasonable creatures have the same revelator, and therefore, one absolute objective truth exists for all. There is but one *logos* revealing truth and wisdom to all, and although in his own nature the absolute one, yet he places himself in manifold forms and modes of activity according to the different wants of reasonable beings to whom he becomes whatever is necessary for their well-being.

The generation of the *logos*, or Son, should in his opinion not be conceived of as something that once happened and was ended; rather is it to be thought of (all notions of time being abstracted therefrom) as a timeless and eternal ever-becoming—a non-beginning and never-ending present. Origen was the first who clearly defined the Church doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son. All of his conceptions, however, of the Father and of His relation to the Son were borrowed from the Platonic notions of the *ὄν* and the *νοῦς*. As in the school of Ammonius the highest *ὄν* was viewed as immeasurably superior to everything else, and elevated in its essence even above the *νοῦς* itself, so Origen thought it necessary that God the Father, should in so far as His essence was concerned be elevated above any other existence, even above the Son. His sentiment upon the relation of the Father and the Son at times clearly varies and evinces a wavering between the Homousian and the Subordination theories, which in the Arian controversy first assumed definite form. In one passage of his writings, at least, in speaking of the generation of the Son, he applies the term *ομοούσιος* to the Son, making Him equal in substance to the Father. But on the other hand, he distinguishes the essence of the Son from that of the Father; speaks of *ἐτερότης*

τῆς οὐσίας, and makes the Son decidedly inferior, calling him merely θεός without the article, viz.: God in an inferior sense, (Deus de Deo.) He evidently, however, appears to strive to bring the Son as near as possible to the essence of the Father, making him the absolute personal wisdom, truth, righteousness and reason. So much did he, nevertheless, subordinate the Son to the Father, that he conceived that prayers should alone be addressed to the Father. By many, Origen has been considered as favoring Arianism, but Dr. Priestley, the great modern advocate of Unitarianism rightly observes, that though he was thought to favor the Arian principle, he did it only in words and not in ideas; and Athanasius assigned him an important place among the authorities who supported his doctrines.

Closely allied to Origen's view, as to the relation of God and the logos, is that which he held of creation itself, in which he strove to hold a middle ground between revelation and the opinion of Ammonius. Creation and annihilation in their modern sense were ideas not conceived of by the ancient world; all held matter as well as God to be eternal, and the Christian doctrine of a creation out of nothing was strange to the philosophic mind. *De nihilo nihil, in nihilum nil posse reverti*, was the received axiom of every school. Origen accepted a creation from nothing, so far as that doctrine expressed, that the free act of God's Almighty power was not conditioned by previous pre-existent matter. When the Scripture declares the creation of this world in time, he accepted it, but adds that an endless succession of worlds had preceded our own, and an endless succession would follow it. In this view he approached the cosmology of the Stoics. It was in this manner that Origen conceived that he had found a solution for the difficulties that present themselves to the philosophic mind against a beginning of creation. Can it be conceived, reasoned he, that if to create is agreeable to the divine essence, this then should ever be wanting? Would not the attributes belonging to the essence of the Divine Being be ever active? A transition therefore from a state of inactivity to the act of creation is inconceivable



without a change, which is incompatible with the being of God. In opposition to the doctrine of emanation, he supposed creation not to be the result of any natural process, but as simply flowing from the Divine will, and he maintained, after the Platonic idea, creation to be a continual becoming.

In connection with Origen's idea of creation is associated his manner of conceiving of the Divine power. The Christian doctrine of Divine Omnipotent Power in contradistinction to the principle of the Heathen religions, (the *δοῦλος θεος ἀναγκη*,) by which even the gods were subjected to a higher necessity, was again something entirely new in religion. This in the minds of the uneducated was accepted as an unlimited arbitrary power, and was conceived in the expression that with God all things are possible. This view presented to the enemies of Christianity many weak points, of which such men as Celsus were not slow in taking advantage, and therewith assailing the Christian system. In opposition to such an unlimited and arbitrary power, Origen stepped forth and sought to reconcile the Omnipotence of God with the principles of reason. "God can do anything," says he, "which does not contradict His essential being as God, His goodness, and wisdom, by which He would not deny His own character as God, as a being of infinite goodness and wisdom." On this subject again he is found mingling the elements of Platonism and Christianity. He accepted the Neo Platonic view, that no consciousness can grasp an infinite series, and hence he inferred that God could not create but only a determinate number of rational beings. This view proved of essential importance in the system of Origen, and was intimately connected with the peculiar shapings of his doctrine of an eternal creation in this, that there was no such thing as a multiplication of the number of created spirits. All manifoldness, instead of being derived from the production of new creatures, were only the changes undergone by those already brought into existence in the eternal creation by Metamorphoses of the original ones. This doctrine in his opinion was of vital importance, as without this it was impossible to place beyond dispute the existence of a personal God, embracing

in His consciousness everything that exists; a truth essential for Christianity to maintain, in opposition to the Neo Platonic theory, which assumed an impersonal  $\delta\nu$ , pure being without consciousness, as the highest and absolute existence, while it only allowed an immanent  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$ .

The creation of the present universe as Origen taught, was a part of the great scheme in the Providence of God needed for satisfaction of divine justice, so that souls might have fields of probation in which to atone for violations of duty. He believed that the Divine Being created ages far past multitudes of minds; devils, angels, and men all equal in dignity and with bodies of an ethereal rarity, and possessed of the power of making choice between good and evil. The freedom that all enjoyed was abused by nearly all in a greater or less degree. As the souls that had sinned were all sent down to inhabit *corporeal bodies*, and the more heinous had been the soul's transgression, so much the deeper was it incased in matter and made to drag out the more ignoble lot. For the habitation of some of those souls whose sins had been less deep, the stars were created. Each soul inhabits a star whose brightness or dimness bears an exact proportion to the moral position of the spirit which animates it. The belief that the heavenly bodies were animated natures, may appear strange in our age, but in the time of Origen, that opinion was almost universal. It had been handed down from superstition to philosophy, and from one philosopher to another from time immemorial. Thales, who gave to everything a soul, did not deny it to these luminaries; Pythagoras had called them gods; Plato also declared them divine; and Philo and Clement regarded them as pure and rational existences. The doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul seemed to Origen to be the only one by which the justice of God and the variform lot of mankind could be reconciled. In the adoption of this opinion, as of many others, it cannot be concealed that the influences of the Neo Platonic school had with him great weight; yet he is original in the reasons by which he defended it. He founded it on the great disparity of condition in which men begin their earthly life. Some possess

rich endowments, both physical and mental, while to others a meagre supply has been assigned. Some are born to great worldly prosperity; others to a miserable condition of servitude and toil. Whence does this difference arise? If the unconditional will of God has made this distinction, then He is partial. It cannot be reconciled with His righteousness unless the inequality of condition is to be ascribed to a difference in the conduct of souls in a state prior to their earthly career. Those souls who sinned most flagrantly are the devils. Human souls occupy an intermediate grade between the star-souls and the devils. God, the eternal and unchangable Being, has no other will than that the fallen souls return to their original state of purity and blessedness, and the material world has been provided by Him as a means of their gradual purification. In this process of purification by means of earthly discipline, they are aided by the souls who remained uncorrupted. Those who are successful in this process after death enter clothed in ethereal bodies, into the land of the blessed, where they shall receive from higher spirits disclosures of truth which were hidden from them on earth, and where they pass through various stages of purification, until they become worthy of the clear vision of God, and are welcomed into perfect happiness. The consummation of the whole will be that all souls will be brought back to their original state of equality, and again fall, and restoration shall eternally alternate. This theory of an eternal series of worlds successively springing up and falling to ruin did not originate with Origen, but was simply borrowed by him from the Stoics and others in compliance with the precepts of Eclecticism, that truth is to be gathered from all sects.

Although Origen was able to find solutions in his philosophy for most intricate problems in Scripture, yet he experienced the greatest difficulty when he endeavored to explain the union of the two natures in Christ. He deemed it utterly impossible that as God was a being altogether incorporeal, he should ever assume a body or be willing to become united to matter—or in other words inasmuch as the divine nature was a substance

generically different from matter, a commingling of the two could never take place. To overcome this difficulty, and at the same time exclude from the divine nature all propension for matter, he conceived that God did not receive the man, but that the latter received the former. But it was only the soul of the man that had received Him. The soul which selected and inhabited the body of Christ preserved the purity of its primitive state, and expended its energies in the contemplation of the *logos* in a more perfect manner than any of the souls that had emanated from the divine nature. This preservation and most intense contemplation of the *logos* procured for this particular soul the privilege that it received into itself the *logos* entire, and thus the whole became one person. By means, therefore, of this union of the soul of Christ with the *logos*, or Son of God, it became possible for God to become united to a human body; not in a direct manner, but indirectly through the soul to which it was united. The *logos* or Son of God did not connect Himself with human flesh; but it was the soul of Christ simply that became incarnate. Nor did the *logos* though inhabiting a body have any intercourse with the body, (Origen thought this impossible;) but only the soul with which the *logos* had some affinity communicated with the body; that is to say, having coalesced with the Son of God as to become one spirit it guided the body, and so regulated all its movements that they could not swerve from the rule of rectitude and duty. The moving cause of the descent of the *Logos* to this earth, and of the incarnation did not flow from the good will of God towards mankind, but it originated in the soul of Christ. The *Logos* or Son of God had no concern save that He became united with the soul of Christ, and then permitted the soul to follow its own wishes and inclinations.

Origen was ignorant of the doctrine of vicarious atonement, considered as placation or satisfaction; and he regarded Christ's sufferings, not as a substitute for ours, but as having merely the same efficacy in kind as the death of any innocent man, only more eminent in degree. This opinion of his seems necessarily to follow his denial of the union of the divine and human

nature in Christ or the hypostatic union; and that only the soul of Christ was united to the Logos or Son of God.

Despite the singular opinions of Origen, the work he performed was imperishable. He must ever stand and be recognized in the Church as the greatest of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, and the one who served as the main guide from Heathen philosophy and the heretical Gnosis to the Christian faith. He is also the father of scientific and critical exegesis. It was he who completed the bridge over the chasm between faith and reason, and was the first to pass it, and seeing the passage entirely safe, he beckoned to his philosophical friends to essay it with him. Most of these wedded to their early prejudices and ancestral pride refused to follow the lead of one whose early training they feared may have deceived him. In vain, however, was the resistance of a Celsus, a Porphyry, a Julian or a Proclus, famed names of philosophy; the Greek intellect was made to perceive the reasonableness of Christianity, and yielded the contest; and Origen in his day, and afterwards in his writings thinned the schools of the masters, and left them without an auditory. Reason was convinced, philosophy dethroned, and Christianity established throughout the Roman Empire. Constantine sat upon the throne of the Cæsars. It was the work of Origen.

## ART. III.—THOUGHTS ON TENDENCIES.

BY REV. I. E. GRAEFF, YAMAQUA, PA.

WHEN Christ said to Peter: "On this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," He evidently meant to warrant the infallible certainty of the perpetual stability of His kingdom. According to this decree there can be no such thing as failure, to the kingdom of heaven in the world. All the powers of darkness combined and striving against its progress throughout the ages, shall not be able to overcome or destroy it. So much at least seems to lie clearly in this royal deliverance of the Master.

Should we take it in the sense, however, that the Church is from the start a fixed fact, in the history of which all change, growth, or development, is excluded at least from the inner structure of her being, we should without doubt misinterpret the Word of God and do violence also to the logic of events. Christ tells us that the history of His Church shall be like unto that of the mustard seed, which starts from a very small grain and groweth into a large tree, amid the branches of which the birds of the air find shelter. This suggests no mere mechanical process, measured and governed altogether by a force lying beyond itself, but a plastic power rather that moves throughout by the law of its own organic life. And should the analogy of this parable be taken to be merely extensive in its bearings, we have immediately after it that of the leaven, the ruling idea of which certainly is clearly intensive, giving us once more the analogy of change, a rising together into a new state, a process of adaptation to the demands of life. By the law of these parables the Church is to be governed, therefore, in her historico-supernatural constitution, and her establishment and existence in the world does accordingly not only involve a formal or extensive promulgation of the dogmas and institutions

of the gospel, but also an intensive realization of the substance of that gospel in the mind and consciousness of the Church itself.

This law comes, then, from the lips of Him who is the way, the truth, and the life, and without whom no one cometh to the Father. It does not rest upon the decree of the divine will merely, as far as the evidence of its reasonableness and truth is concerned, however; for it is no abstraction of any kind, but a tangible historical reality subject to the universal experience of the Christian world and the progressive tendency of the consciousness of our race. It is well known that all history moves not by an outward aggregation of facts or data simply, but that it is the organic evolution rather of life-forces, the re-organizing tendency of which is continually from a lower to a higher state of perfection, both in the order of nature and that of grace. The Mosaic law seemed to be rigidly fixed and limited on every side; it guaranteed an economy that was absolutely cut off from all amalgamating contact with the world, and that apparently forbid every change, growth, or development, in the bosom of its own genius, and yet history proves that it did emphatically change and develop. It was not just the same in every sense, in the hands of king David and the later prophets, that it was under the personal administration of its divinely inspired founder. The difference was of course not one of kind, but of degree—it simply consisted in the necessary historic realization and enlargement of the original prophetic or Messianic tenor of the old covenant. And so again, John the Baptist, did not exactly occupy the same ground with the inspired men of former times. He was the immediate forerunner of the Lord, and he was therefore the greatest of all the prophets; not because he was more gifted or talented than these, but because he stood nearer the grand era of universal redemption, the inauguration of which he was allowed to witness and to proclaim. Times had changed, old things were passing away, and all things were now about to be made new in a sense promised indeed long before but only to be properly and fully realized in this prophetic fullness of time.



From this we see, then, that the Mosaic economy had its necessary positively progressive tendency, from its beginning to its close, looking steadily towards its fulfillment in the higher economy of freedom and grace. But it had also its secularizing tendencies, which led it to yield more or less to the spirit of the times, or to the world-spirit of the ages. All its legalistic rigor, supported by the most awful guarantees of the divine presence, did not prevent it from coming under the influence of the vulgar idolatry of the early ages, or from imbibing some of the speculative notions and corrupt manners of the later classic era. In its origin and genius it was not of the world, but it was in the world, and therefore it had to enter into the current of the world's history and deal with the issues of the world's life, in order to reach its own proper destiny and end.

Now if this was necessarily the experience of the Jewish dispensation, with all its rigid lines of demarkation and divine warrants of stability, we may reasonably look for a broader freedom in the construction and progress of the gospel, which has never been restricted in the same way or limited to any narrow bounds in the enforcement of its principles. We may lawfully look here, surely, for a plastic adaptability, which shall prove itself fully equal to all the problems of history. Two factors are here joined together, more organically and more radically than ever before. The one is divine, comes from above in the person of Jesus Christ, enters into the history of the world and is made the ruling power of its life. The other is the life of the world in its generic totality, it is human and comes into organic relation to Christ so that it is made to share the saving influence of His life and grace. We are told that Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever, and that hence there can be no fundamental revolution in either His character, person, or work. These are once for all the finished mystery of the truth and grace of God, in all the ages past, present, and yet to come. But with His kingdom in the world it is otherwise. This has to take up the various phenomena, tendencies and life-powers of humanity and deal with its problems in a historic way. Every stadium of its movement and

every era of its experience must accordingly not only be subject to the law of progressive evolution in the legitimate order of its own higher tendency, but it must take up also, into its historic current, the fluctuations and secularizing powers of its lower, or human side, so that these may be raised up to the high level of the purity, freedom and glory of the divine factor. Here then historical movements must be more comprehensive, radical and intense, than anywhere else, and they will be downward or secularizing, as well as upward and spiritualizing, in their tendencies. The world-spirit of the times will give color to religious creed and custom, and the spirit of the gospel must prove itself the master of secular forces and cast them in its own mind, amid the war of ideas and the conflict of principles.

Not all periods are alike in their historic peculiarities. In the early ages, the Church had to battle with Judaizing notions on the one hand, and with the moral obliquity and religious empiricism of classic Paganism on the other—it was a terrific contest in the life-current of evangelic progress, which ended in a grand victory of evangelic orthodoxy. The period of the middle ages presents a gigantic arena of rude manners, and of uncultivated barbaric ideas, in war with the genius of order and Christian civilization, but the process throughout was still onward and upward. Modern times are characterized by a peculiar scientific skepticism, which deals its vigorous blows in all directions and tries, in its madness, to pull down the very heavens to its own secular level. Hence we see that there is always a world-spirit, in combat with the genius of the gospel, which characterizes the popular tone and religious thinking of the times, and although the nature of the struggle is always the same—on the one hand, evangelism; on the other, secularism—the scenes of the grand drama change at every stage.

The secularizing genius of the present day differs, in its distinctive tone, radically from that of preceding ages. It is tending powerfully towards the removal of sacramental distinctions between the kingdom of nature and that of grace. Of course the spirit of unbelief has always been at work, yet it did not always enter the field with the same ideas, nor did it always

meet with the same unrestricted advantages that give it full play at the present time. Former generations stood much more under the objective forces of religion and the Church. Individual freedom was more limited and circumscribed—even the Reformers of the sixteenth century never dreamt of such relaxation of authority as now prevails. The objectivity of the past has given way to an extreme subjectivity, which has been constantly tending in the direction of a social and religious chaos, and madly striving after a complete rupture with the life of the ages that have gone before. The professedly evangelical thinking of the day is strongly characterized by this state of the popular mind, and hence a lowering of ecclesiastical power and a free reign of individual caprice. We need not wonder therefore that this is an age of materialistic skepticism, fraught with imminent danger to a sound Christologico-sacramental piety. Still if we look at the matter with an unprejudiced eye and judge it in the light of history, we will very likely be led to see that it is just what should have been expected and what the life of humanity itself demands as a necessary link in the chain of the onward flow of its destiny.

But shall this secularizing mood be more successful in its distinctive hostility to the objective churchly realities of the Christian faith than the secularism of previous ages has been? Taking into view all the circumstances of the case, we may safely take the ground that its prospects of final success are less than before, and that the triumphs of the gospel will be all the more marked and glorious. The Christian experience of the day rests so firmly on the facts and dogmas of the New Testament, and is so deeply imbedded in the life and genius of the Creed, that it will be fully able to master the skepticism of the generation that now is, just as it has mastered that of generations long since numbered with the dead. If the proud spirit of ancient Greece was forced to bow to the irresistible testimony of Galilean fishermen, we also may hope to witness the re-enactment of the same tragic episode, between the rising strength of Christological orthodoxy on the one hand, and the reigning tide of infidel, rationalistic, or unchurchly, religious secularism on

the other. And what gives additional force to our faith in the supremacy and all-sufficiency of the gospel, is the law of self-preservation which comes in here as a powerful auxiliary to our hopes. Society cannot do without religion, not without the Church, and hence one-sided heretical and infidel tendencies will sooner or later be met by powerful reactionary movements. In fact, such reaction has already begun, its phenomena are already boldly coming to view, some of its victories are already won, and when the final conflict shall be over, science, reason, and private judgment, will undoubtedly do cheerful honor to the objective mystery of the kingdom of God, as the only key to the moral dignity of the secular universe and the destiny of the human race. That shall be the age of true manhood and glory, when the demands of legitimate authority shall be fully harmonized with the dignity and rights of the individual, and when the supernatural verities of the Christian faith shall have absolute sway over the minds of an intelligent but willing people. The genius of the times seems to be tending towards this broad and liberal issue more than ever before, and the very chaos and confusion of ideas which we so often deplore, may do much to hasten the coming of the grand era of our hopes.

Public beneficence is a generous element in modern society. The Church evidently is the source from whence this element has come, as in its origin and early history it was distinctly churchly in all its institutions, movements and measures. Then it stood altogether in connection with the Church, from the genius of which it sprung. The world under the reign of paganism knew nothing of public beneficence, but in modern times the guardianship of this sacred trust is largely in her hands. Now the State has her almshouses, and her asylums. A prodigious array of organizations, secret and open, has sprung up which make it their special business and object to push forward the work of beneficial or charitable support. Society is much more generous, much more tender, much more inspired by the spirit of universal brotherhood and mutual sympathy, than it was when the great apostle of the gentiles

inaugurated the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem. But the source from whence this change has come is now apparently ignored and public charity, that powerful agency of the Christian faith wielded so triumphantly in former times by the Church, is at this time too extensively wielded by profane hands. It is in possession of large resources. It counts its followers by thousands and hundreds of thousands. It spends its monies by millions upon millions of dollars. But it makes provision for the body, and hardly for the soul. It is more concerned about the secular and mundane support, than about the ministry of religion and of Christ. In its ruling genius it is beneficial, more than it is charitable. It is a power of tremendous prestige, and the fact that it has become so extensively secularized is to be deeply regretted. If it were in full accord with the Church and orthodox Christological ideas, it would be tenfold more a power for good than it is in its present position and spirit. We know that it claims the Christian name and vast religious importance, even where it stands entirely aloof from all churchly connections or positive Christian influences; but this only proves that it has been perverted from its original genius, and it now either consciously or unconsciously dishonors the mother that gave it birth. Who then, let us inquire, is responsible for this prodigious revolution in the relationship and aims of public beneficence?

It is not to be expected that, with the vigor of Christian ideas fully at work, men should remain dead to the impulses of mutual sympathy and help. And if all the energies of Christian charity were once so fully under the control of the agencies of the Church, and in such complete accord with her proper sacramental spirit, it is certainly a matter for very serious inquiry as to why this beneficent agency has been so largely estranged from her bosom, and so extensively withdrawn from her service. Why do her brotherhoods and sisterhoods of charity not bloom and abound in good works now, even more than they did in days of yore? Why has the office of deacons and deaconesses lost so much of its primitive fervor and force? Perhaps it may be that the Church, in the zeal of evangelical

orthodoxy, has either neglected or repudiated these things in the mistaken notion that society could be lifted above the need of public beneficence by the advancement of material progress. This was a serious error, as every one may easily see, an error that is telling with powerful effect on the progress of evangelical religion. If the evil is to be remedied, this error must be corrected, and this cannot be done by mere declamation against the rationalistic secularism of the age. It will not answer to indulge in angry denunciations of the various orders and societies, that have charge of this matter. No amount of pious indignation will cure the wrong. The plain matter of fact is, the Church will have to return to her former self-sacrificing munificence, to her sacramental ideas of brotherhood, and organize once more a scheme of charity broader and nobler than any that can be maintained beyond her pale, and she will have no difficulty to win back the sceptre she allowed so ingloriously to drop from her sacred grasp. Any other policy must necessarily end in disappointment, defeat and injury.

The intellectual struggle of the ages has assumed a very significant and peculiar aspect in modern times. This struggle is no longer under the guardianship of religion, or under the direction of theological culture, as it has been in the life of by-gone periods. The temper of the times has been battling rather for complete independency from all such jurisdiction, for the purpose of settling the problems of science and intelligence in the interest of a rigid materialism. We do not mean that intellectual culture is wholly given to this materializing scheme theoretically, but practically it certainly is falling in very much with its tenor. All this is quite natural and easily accounted for, in view of the surroundings. The age is one of material progress. Science is come down from the celestial regions, and is burrowing in the bowels of the earth. She devotes herself to the investigation of nature and the development of the resources of our globe, with direct reference to the physical demands of our race. Steam-power, electro-magnetism, and the whole paraphernalia of modern inventions, are pressed into her service, and there is no interest, secular, moral or religious,

that can long remain beyond the reach of her mighty impulses. It is not surprising that such a world-movement, so sedulously given to secular matters or considerations, should become restive under the tutelage of theological mannerism, and in its struggle for freedom should be liable to commit the folly of rushing from Scylla into Charybdis.

Yet it would be a mistake to suppose, that this modern intellectual tendency is aiming simply at the removal of theological tutorship. It looks further than that. It is making war also upon the "humanities," with a view of thrusting these out of the position they have held in the educational curriculum, and putting into their place the "utilities" of the day. The tendency may therefore be regarded as a downward one, looking as it evidently does, habitually and pre-eminently, to secular ends, and making very small account of the æsthetical, the ethical and the spiritual. The popular culture of the age, especially in this country, seems to be ruled almost entirely by this utilitarian world-spirit, and even what is commonly called "higher culture" seems to be yielding more and more to its demands. And in addition to this we have one more fact that looks more threatening than all the rest—the popular religious thinking of the times is very much drawn into this secularizing current, and if it has begun in the spirit it now bids fair to end in the flesh. All this makes it appear as if the intellect was to be dwarfed to the drudgery of materialism and an infidel millenium inaugurated, during the reign of which the powers of Hades may succeed in burying out of sight the hateful carcass of Christian civilization, and give us a specimen of another reign of "reason" more bloody and barbarous than that of the famous French revolution.

This is, however, but one side of the picture, and it will not do to come to any conclusion in reference to the probable issues of the case, without first taking a full view of the other side of the picture also. It is clear that human nature is sinfully inclined and yields easily to downward tendencies; still it is not at all likely that it will, in the face of all Christian experience and the history of the past intellectual culture of the race, cast it-



self blindly into the embrace of a sensual secularism. If the majority are sensual and governed by mere selfish considerations, there is yet a ruling thinking minority who are not willing to come down to such vulgar limits, or be ruled by such degrading ends. This fact alone stands as a guarantee that the bold and sweeping intellectual utilitarianism of to-day, will not very speedily put to naught the wisdom of the culture of former times; and if we had nothing but this single argument to build upon, we might safely enter the lists with the champions of materialism for a wager. But we have a better foundation than this to build our hopes upon. He who has said that the gates of hell shall not prevail against His Church, has proven Himself quite able to preside over the destiny of historical movements in all the ages of His reign, and we have no reason to suspect that the supremacy will ever be taken from His hands. The air castles of the rationalistic frenzy of the last half century have been brought down into the dust most wonderfully, and this was nothing new nor surprising either, as things of the kind had happened before. The gifted and cultivated children of Hellas came down from the lofty pinnacle of their own philosophical self-conceit, and placed themselves squarely on the loftier ideal of the gospel narrative. And between modern times and the primitive ages there lieth a period, which has sometimes been consigned, honestly and piously, to the full reign of the Devil, because it was an age of barbaric ignorance, corruption and violence. But strange to tell, this Satanic millenium ended in a singular triumph for Christ and His kingdom, and it is now well understood that the mediæval period was actually the creative period of Christian civilization, and that modern society is largely indebted to it for its intelligent and liberal ideas of social and political economy. If there was a helmsman that could so skillfully guide the ship in the midst of such adverse winds and waves, it may not be unreasonable to trust Him a little while longer, though there should be signs of rushing waves upon waves and placing mountains upon mountains with a view of storming the heavens.

But the matter is not to be dealt with in an abstract way, or

as if it rested entirely in the hands of the Master, and as if His people had nothing to do but passively and devoutly to witness the demonstrations of His historico-supernatural supremacy. Human agency, let it not be forgotten, is one of the factors in the life-process of history, and even though the Captain guide the vessel, there can be no successful and prosperous voyage without the co-operation of the crew. From the temper of the times we may rationally judge that no mere authoritative deliverance of any kind, coming from any quarter whatever, will answer the purpose. The contest must clearly be one of ideas, of principles, of free thought, in the fullest sense of the word, and give full scope to the lawful play of individual opinion and the normal demands of secular interests, and yet it must be positively evangelico-christological—it must be deeply and firmly rooted in the life of the past, as well as do full justice to all the rational demands of the present. Now the question for us is, whether we have a philosophy broad and humane enough and sufficiently imbued with the Catholic genius of the New Testament evangel, to grapple with and master these colossal issues of the history of the times. Are we prepared to go into a free fight on the arena of science, philosophy and religion, and to stand in the contest against all the demoralizing tendencies of the times? This clearly is for us, the solemn question of the hour.

We have said that this conflict must be eminently Christological, and we may add without the fear of a successful contradiction, that it must begin with the proper organic readjustment of the relation of theological to secular science. It is just here where a reactionary movement comes in, that will not fail to bring the boisterous waves of the reigning secularism to their proper level. If the intellectual culture of former times was essentially theological, so much so indeed that our civilization is the direct or organic product of the genius of the Christian faith, that which shall ultimately control the destiny of the present and the future, although the aspect of the relationship of the main factors of our modern cultus seems to be radically changed, shall be no less Christian and no less theological.

There are tendencies at work now that amount to nothing short, in their tenor and aim, of a profound revolution in the theologico-religious thinking of the age. They spring from the depth of the religious consciousness in its most comprehensive character, and they are therefore not to be classed with the mere fanciful creations of individual brains. To look at them in any other light than that of a portentous historical world-movement, is simply to betray a lack of philosophical penetration and a miserable unfitness to play the part of a defender of the faith. We take the ground that no movement of any historical significance in the progress of the world, can reach its destiny without a religious basis to rest upon; and as the history of modern times must be Christological to be normal, it must be taken for granted that any revolution looking toward the normal historic reassertion of the supremacy of Christian ideas in the culture of the age, is to be regarded as a hopeful sign of the times.

But we cannot and dare not stop short with mere ideas, though they be ever so profoundly philosophical and Christological. Neither would it agree with the demands of the case to look upon the supremacy of Christian ideas as a formal court, standing over and above the machinery of intellectual culture and dictating to it thus in a foreign and arbitrary way. All that can be asked or lawfully expected is, that the Christian faith in its proper evangelico-sacramental character, be recognized and honored as the normative rule or common law of intellectual culture, and that this, under such general direction and impulse, be allowed to work out its problems according to the law of its own sphere. Accordingly a proper organization of the educational forces is of the utmost importance. Education could no longer meet the wants of the times, if it were not brought within the reach of all. It must necessarily be common and popular, and aim at the cultivation of the masses. Still it would be a sad mistake to popularize it so as to set aside organized gradations in its institutions. The necessary legitimate relation of such gradations is one of the grand problems of the day, and one that may well claim the attention of the best minds.

We need unification in the realm of secular culture as well as in the sphere of Christian thought, in order to secure such an accumulation of moral and intellectual forces as will be competent to master the mighty issues of modern history, and to conduct the race to the highest pinnacle of freedom, purity and bliss.

We are happy to find that we are tending towards this unification, which aims at an educational scheme or economy that shall embrace all the interests of popular culture, in their normal organic grades. The cause of common school education is pushed with tremendous vigor, and there is a growing sense of the necessity of joining it to the institutions of a higher culture, in order to make it properly complete and satisfactory in its own sphere. And on the part of the higher institutions we rejoice to see a disposition to come down to and join hands with the lower, so that in this way the sphere and character of both may be enlarged and elevated. In some quarters this matter is urged forward with really munificent grandeur, and with an intelligent appreciation of the far-reaching importance of the movement. We are only sorry to see that our grand old commonwealth of Pennsylvania is not yet fully up to the lofty ideal of this tendency, but especially that the Anglo-German portion of our rising nationality do not stand in the very front rank of its intelligent promulgators. Not that they are not at all consciously apprehended in the life of the process, and are not carried on with it in its upward course. We only regret that their status has not yet fully reached the high level of their acknowledged intellectual capacity, for the mastery of such an issue.

We of German origin, and of German religious and theological affinities, want grand educational centres in this country. We want them in justice to the fair fame, and the high intellectual and Christian culture of the fatherland, We want them in the interest of an Anglo-American culture, such as the broad and comprehensive movements of our progressive American nationality imperatively demand. These centres need to be liberally endowed, and thus to be raised above the standard of

all institutions of a local order, or a second or third rate character. We are aware that endowments however liberal, and faculties however large and able, with other accommodations of the most comprehensive kind, do not necessarily make first class institutions. We know that there have been schools and colleges of great renown and of long-continued influence and power, which did not rest on any such material foundation. But times change, and so do the genius and patronage of intellectual culture. It has always been a wise policy to embody ideas in institutions suited to the demands of the times, and if there ever was a time when broad and liberal schemes, backed up by large pecuniary and other resources, were peremptorily required by the culture of the age, that time is now. Wherever there is a desire to have any part in the shaping of the destiny of the American people, either in an intellectual, moral or religious point of view, this fact dare not be ignored.

---

#### ART. IV.—THE SERVICE PREPARATORY TO THE HOLY COMMUNION.

---

BY H. WISSLER, LOVETTSVILLE, VA.

---

JUDGING from the variety of services that a person meets with, which are made to pass for Preparatory Communion Services, the inference may fairly be drawn that the ideal of such a service, on the part of many to whose lot it falls to give form to the worship on the occasion in question, is very deficient. Indeed, to form an opinion of the importance of such services from the particular character by which they are often distinguished, one would conclude that there is very little importance attached to them. They are often of the most meager character. Almost any kind of a sermon is made to answer for the occasion; in which an observer would look in vain for any characteristics that distinguish it from the ordinary pulpit discourse; save that in a few closing paragraphs some

unnatural reference is made to the Holy Communion. And if, besides this, there is any part of the service that is different from the usual Lord's-day service, which is often frigid and barren enough to make it tasteless and almost intolerable to such as come to the sanctuary to unburden their hearts of a sense of guilt, and to feed upon the true bread of life, the difference, not unfrequently, is of such a nature, and the service so unlike on succeeding occasions, as greatly to embarrass the would-be worshiper and effectually close up his heart and soul against a free flow of a true Christian devotion.

To this want of a service that carries with it force, may be ascribed, to a not inconsiderable degree, the neglect on the part of many professing Christians to be present and participate in Preparatory Services; added to this the absence of a sense of the true nature and design of these services.

There is a particular type of a service which is adapted to a preparation for the blessed Eucharist. Liturgical services, of course, there ought to be, and the most carefully prepared, so as to comprehend the true idea of such a service, and rendered in the most skillful way, that for the time they may have the greatest possible efficiency. But the sermon that is preached or the exhortation that is given, ought also to be of a specific nature and directly adapted to the occasion. It is certainly a nice point to preach an appropriate preparatory sermon. The occasion is one of the most difficult that a minister can occupy. It is no matter of surprise that the person who assays such a sermon, should often regret his failure when the task is over.

One of the hopeful signs of the Church consists in the fact, that she is becoming more or less dissatisfied with the deficient Preparatory Services which in many communities have latterly had place;—and it might easily be proved that many years since these services were much better,—and is now seeking after something superior, and which shall be more fully commensurate with her sense of the importance of the Lord's Supper.

There is no specific form laid down in the Holy Scriptures for the service in question; and yet indirectly there is allusion made, in several places, to the essential features of such a

service. From these references some idea may be formed of the controlling thought that must enter into it; but in part the idea must be gathered from the general subject of worship, from corresponding services in the Old Testament economy, and from the intuitive sense which the Church cherishes of a preparation for a distinguished favor in the participation of the Sacred Supper. It is written that we shall "purge out the old leaven, that we may be a new lump;" because "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us," (1 Cor. v. 7). In these Scriptures there is an allusion to the paschal lamb of ancient Israel, and at the same time they are applied to the higher verities which this typified; not directly to the Lord's Supper, but to the great privileges of the Christian religion under the figure of a feast, which may be appropriately said to culminate in this blessed Sacrament. It is written again that a man shall "examine himself," and "so eat" of the "bread" and "drink" of the "cup" of the Lord. To this it is added that "many are weak and sickly" because they eat and drink unworthily. And prior to this we read that to eat and to drink the bread of the Lord unworthily, is to eat and drink damnation to ourselves, not discerning the Lord's Body, (1 Cor. xi. 27-30). This has immediate reference to the subject in question, and is most pertinent because of the importance which it attaches to a favorable condition for the Holy Communion.

I. One essential feature in such a preparation consists in *self-examination*. Whatever is most conducive to the accomplishment of this subject is most appropriate; be it the reading of Scripture, in the form of the commandments, the preaching of a sermon, exhortation, or the use of a solemn litany. Though such an examination is not inappropriately attended by a clear exhibition of the evil of sin, and of the way of salvation through the atoning blood of Jesus Christ. What the heart needs is a sense of its own condition, as this may be gathered from the life of the individual; from the thoughts, desires, and actions that have given shape to that life, and from the relation of the person towards his God. Self-examination must have regard not merely to the general, but also to the



particular. Reference must be had not exclusively to the consideration, whether a person is a member of the great body of the Christian Church, and so in a general way a professor of faith and a disciple of Christ; but also to the fact whether he improves the opportunities of the Gospel, is a man of prayer, loves God, leads a holy life, and is charitable towards his fellow-men. The individual shall notice whether he is in possession of a lively faith, of a positive, earnest piety, and not one merely of a general habit, and, it may be, of a lifeless formality. And more still; careful investigation shall be made, whether the person has not been guilty of any particular offences against God which demand a remedy.

The object now is not so much to learn of our good qualities, as to search and see whether there is any evil way within us. If any wicked acts were committed this is the time to think of them. One's past life must come into review, and the consequent state of the heart be noted. And upon a work of such self-recollection should follow a final clearing up of the person's transgressions in the past; and such periods ought to be of frequent and stated occurrence.

It is not expedient that some sins should be repented of and confessed and not others. All efforts to obtain forgiveness for later sins avail little, so long as a faithful effort was not made to obtain the pardon of earlier transgressions. While conscience smites for the distant past no peace can be found for that which is near at hand. The most solemn admonitions come to us to seek a relief from the burden of the offences committed long since, if such a load there be, and to commence to live as near right as possible for the future.

Sometimes, indeed, a sense of guilt follows man from the time of the commission of a particular crime, and in no ordinarily easy way can he divest himself of this sense; "And if our hearts condemn us, God is greater than our hearts and knoweth all things." But at other times we may have committed sins in our thoughtless ways, which we have well nigh forgotten, but which God has not forgotten. If there are such sins, it would be well to know them, that the remedy which

they need may be applied; if none are discovered, through the process of investigation, it will do no harm to have made a careful scrutiny. If, after a careful examination, "our hearts condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God." But who, if he is not convicted of any particular, gross offences in the overt act and of lust in the heart, has not still some deep sense of depravity and general unworthiness and guilt? All are at best very imperfect, and our souls are continually marked by new traces of sin.

He is a skillful physician of the soul who is most successful in discovering to the sick the leprosy of sin which cleaves to them.

II. Following self-examination and a disclosure of guilt, there must needs be, in a preparation for the Holy Communion, or any other improvement of the Gospel, a *confession*. By this is meant, as every one will understand, a confession which is the result of a sincere repentance. What else could the prodigal do when he discovered his mistake, than repent, and returning say, "Father, I have sinned against heaven and in Thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called Thy son?" We cannot hide our sins. We may conceal them from our fellow-men, but cannot cloak them against ourselves and against God. Man cannot pen up his grief in his own bosom. When he is once convicted of sin it is like a burning fire in his deepest vitals. It allows him no rest. It becomes more and more consuming in its power until the heart finds relief in a sincere confession, or the unfortunate man becomes the victim of the worm that dieth not.

Our deepest sense of religion teaches us that there is relief in a confession of sins. "Confession is good for the soul." Even the common sorrows of life are greatly lightened, if we can communicate them to a sympathizing friend. Who has not thus made a confidant of another, and in turn been a confidant? The grief which is the result of having injured an innocent neighbor is likewise moderated by confessing to him one's fault. The same course our most common ideas of religion dictate in reference to God, and the sins which we have committed against Him.

We are explicitly taught, however, on this subject, "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper, but whose confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy." "If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

We cannot in good faith ask God to forgive us our sins, until we confess them to Him. There is need of more than an implied acknowledgment; of a full, hearty confession.

Such a confession, in a deep humiliation, is one of the fundamental ideas of a service preparatory to the Holy Communion. The sinner comes at such a time to prostrate himself before God, that his soul may be cleansed from guilt. Even the penitential tear is most appropriate to the hour.

A confession of sins, after this manner prior to a participation in the Lord's Supper, was a very early practice in the Christian Church. Our German fathers, as is distinctly remembered by many living witnesses, gave prominence to this idea in a preparatory service. They went to the confession, (*Beichte*). A common humiliation in this way, on the part of the united congregation, was the original practice of the Church in making confession of sins unto God, over against the subsequently introduced custom, in a certain part of Christendom, of a private confession. Still the importance of this office lies not so much in the particular outward form in which the duty is performed, as in the spirit in which it is done. It must be accomplished in a sincere penitence. Every one must confess his own sins, and from a general there must be a particular humiliation and supplication of the divine favor. All have sinned and come short of the glory of God. All need peace. Dust and ashes become each one. Every heart should give vent to the deep cry of grief, and sue earnestly with God for mercy and forgiveness, and a full restoration into His favor.

In this view of the service in question, it is something more than a mere caprice on the part of a pastor, if he desire the presence of all the communicants of his congregation at such a time. Nor can the Church afford to forego the advantages of this service.

III. Everything turns ultimately on one's success in obtaining *pardon*. If the penitent succeeds in this, then he has made a self-examination and a confession of sins to a good purpose. Forgiveness of the iniquities that have been committed, is what is needed, as an additional condition of the soul to the presence of a sincere lively faith. The sinner needs pardon to bear testimony of God's mercy. He needs pardon, that he may have a clean heart into which to receive Christ in the body and blood of His Holy Supper; that he may eat and drink to the best advantage.

That there is forgiveness with God, is a prominent article in the Christian creed. In this faith lies the disciple's only hope of mercy. To have this faith is the deep comfort of his heart. Being the offspring of a sinful parentage and by nature guilty, and committing new transgressions every day of our lives, the hope of pardon is as a soothing balm to the sin-stricken soul. When we transgress God's holy law we can be restored to favor with Him and can be filled with all joy and peace in believing.

That God forgives sin when the individual Christian cries to Him for mercy, is not to be doubted. He encourages us to believe that He "forgives us our debts, as we forgive our debtors." For this frequent request should be made of Him in the closet and in the circle of the family around the family altar. But that there are special advantages for obtaining forgiveness when we approach God in the capacity of a congregation of worshipers, we can also not reasonably question. When assembled in this form we have the influence of the united faith and prayers of the Church. We have the union of two or three to whom special promises of success are given, of a whole congregation, asking something in the Lord's name; shall it not be given them?

It is a general Christian feeling that the prayers of the Church avail more than the prayers of a single individual. It is a common conclusion that the intercessions of a minister afford a better hope and are more comforting than the prayers of another person, other things being equal; from the fact it

may be presumed, that he is the minister of God, to the functions of whose office it pertains to offer the prayers of the people and to pray for them. Sick persons who are concerned for their salvation like to have the minister bear them before God in prayer; and to be the subject of the prayers of the united congregation. Such a feeling is a wholesome sentiment in the Church.

In addition to such considerations in favor of the power of a congregation, special prerogatives are rightfully accorded in our minds to a people who, in addition to being organized as a congregation, including pastor and all, are engaged in a service preparatory to the Holy Communion. Such a service may be expected to correspond in importance and power with the importance of the Communion itself. The favorable state of the Christian heart which the exalted character of the Holy Supper supposes, is in this service to be directly secured; especially in the direction of the realization of a sense of pardoned guilt. The congregation is expressly encouraged and led to a free confession of sins, and to a wrestling with God for mercy and peace. The general feeling which is entertained by Christians, that we must confess our sins in order that we may obtain forgiveness of the same, is here specially located and brought to something real. Confession may not be put off from time to time, be neglected and forgotten, but must come to something definite and conclusive, that pardon may be secured. This is the time and the place.

At the same time there is comprehended, most appropriately, in this service a specific act in which the penitent shall realize a sense of pardon. This act consists, following the confession of sins, in a formal absolution by the minister. It finds its power in the prerogative entrusted to the Christian ministry by the Lord Himself and delegated to it in His own words—"Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained," (St. John xx. 23). This act serves as a culmination to our sense of pardon. It brings that general sense, that there is forgiveness with God, to a definite reality; to which the professing

Christian can look for the realization of his hope of comfort and peace.

The burdened heart wants something specific, and is not satisfied with vague generalities.

But this declaration of pardon,—to guard the subject in hand against abuse,—is not unconditionally and indiscriminately made for every member of the congregation. It is a declaration of pardon to such “as have made confession of sins unto God, with hearty repentance and sincere faith, being resolved to turn from them, and to follow after righteousness and true holiness in time to come.” And even this forgiveness is pronounced “through the perfect satisfaction of the most holy passion and death of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Properly understood and appreciated this part of a Preparatory Service comprises one of the most comfortable offices of our holy religion.

Whether what we have now written on the subject of a Preparation for the Holy Communion be the proper idea, as we believe it is, or whether it is not, the service in question is evidently, more and more, taking this particular form. The Church is no longer well satisfied with anything that is less churchly.

ART. V.—SCRIPTURAL TESTIMONY TO THE LAYING ON OF  
HANDS.

BY REV. P. E. DAVIS, A. M., CHAMBERSBURG, PA.

THE interest that many earnest men are feeling in the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ as a supernatural constitution of grace in which are lodged the "powers of the world to come," has naturally called forth much thought and discussion in regard to the Solemn Ordinance of the Laying on of Hands. The great question that challenges us is this: Are we to recognize it as a divinely-instituted form in and through which something is bestowed upon men, or are we to regard it as a mere empty rite? Is there any objective force in it, or is there not?

From the day of Pentecost on through many centuries no one seemed to regard it as a useless manipulation. If it were necessary to defend this assertion we would find the history of the Church with her teaching and practice "like the tower of David builded for an armory, whereon there hang a thousand bucklers, all shields of mighty men." But no piece of this armor do we wish to take down. We are well aware that with many all such historical evidence amounts to nothing. They would "be of the same opinion still," if we were to quote and reprint enough of it to shingle any conventicle in the land. And so any effort in that direction would be a dead loss all around.

Nor do we wish to appeal to the fact that this rite is practiced by almost all Christians at the present time. Those who rail against forms and yet show themselves to be the veriest formalists by keeping up useless habits, are not likely to be disturbed by their own glaring inconsistency. If they can accompany the administration of a Sacrament with a tirade against its efficacy, they can just as easily accompany the administration of this rite with sneering remarks about "the Holy



Ghost trickling from one man's fingers upon another man's head." This is, of course, the easiest possible way to get rid of the whole subject. A few supercilious jibes and jeers and a little violent declamation are the "fat, pitch and hair" with which these modern Daniels slay many a dragon.

As a general thing those who dispose of these grave questions in this summary way, profess to have that superior spirituality which rises above the necessity of any outward means of grace. They might admit, for instance, in theory that the "Laying on of hands" is an ordinance of Divine appointment, and that it was practiced by holy men of old for given purposes, but these same persons would perhaps contend that it is something with which we of the nineteenth century and especially in this republican form of government can very easily dispense. They cannot with the natural eye detect the processes of grace in any such operation; the dynamic force is not patent to the human understanding, and these after all are the tests to which all such things must be submitted and by which they must be measured. This is just the rationalistic logic that would do away with all of God's outward appointments, not only with the Sacraments but with the preached word itself and tie us down to the inner light of the Quaker. Nay, more: even here we could have no hope, for the most subjective feelings of the human heart produced by the Holy Ghost must ever elude and defy all of our powers of ratiocination. Here is something over which the regal intellect of St. Paul bowed as an awful mystery: here is one of the things into which the angels desired to look and were not able. And if we start out with the postulate that we are to be able to analyze and comprehend all the processes of grace, we must land high and dry in the cold bleak regions not only of the worst formalism, but of infidelity itself.

It is not strange that people with this rationalistic posture of mind should ignore the Church and all the objective mysteries of grace as they exist and operate in fact; nor can it be thought strange that having ignored the Kingdom of Grace itself they should find it necessary to ignore all that God has

said in regard to it. It is true that they always appeal to the Bible as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. They plume themselves upon their credence in every jot and tittle there written and pledge themselves to full submission to its teachings. But the whole structure of the word of God and all of its particular assertions are so out of harmony with their unchurchly theories that the two can never be reconciled. What then? The statements of holy writ must be cut down to square with the theory. The theory has been approved at the bar of human judgment beyond which there is no higher court. It is fully enthroned in the human mind, and sooner than disturb its reign any liberty may be taken with the word of God. The assumption is that reason is the critic and not the disciple of revelation, and that anything that transcends its powers must be explained away if not flatly denied. And it is startling to see with what easy assurance any declarations that speak of the institutions of the Church as grace-bearing, are disposed of. It is so in regard to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and it is so in regard to the Laying on of Hands.

But after all, it is easy to see, that this is not putting honor on the word of God. If we have faith in what He says, we must recognize some concrete reality answering to His record. Without this recognition we resolve what He has told us into a mirage of the desert, speaking of water where there is no water. Who in this barren waste of sin would be willing to consign himself to such misery as this would imply? Who would be willing to belie the Heavenly Father by turning His Yea and Amen in Christ, into a mere verbal promise made to our ears to be broken to our hopes? This to our mind is far less consistent than the infidelity that rejects the sacred Scriptures, because it disbelieves the whole order of Divine truth and facts which they express.

But we should be consistent believers, rather than consistent infidels. This, however, requires that we should not only recognize God's voice in every utterance, but regard the facts to which He calls our attention. We must not only look into the mirror, but acknowledge the real objects which it reflects, for

when the body falls the shadow vanishes. With this idea before us, let us see whether the history of the Laying on of Hands as this comes out in the solemn intimations and expressions of the Bible, comports with the notion that it may be regarded as a wholesome, but nevertheless empty rite.

In calling attention to this subject we wish it to be understood that our route lies along the main course of Bible history, and that we have neither time nor disposition to turn off upon any branch roads. With "the three orders of the ministry;" with the distinction between benediction, ordination, and confirmation; and with the difference between the sacraments and such ordinances as we are now considering, we have nothing to do at present. We are well aware of the lengthy and fierce discussions that have been had on these questions. They are apt to degenerate into Donnybrook Fair fights, in which we wish to swing no shillelah until the deeper question is settled, viz.: whether there is in this rite any investiture or bestowal in any case. That is the main issue;—the corner-stone upon which the whole fabric rests. If we take that away, everything built upon it falls to the ground, and there is nothing worth fighting about. Then, there is no act, for instance, by which *any* order of the ministry is constituted. All men can exercise its functions, and there is nothing to prevent any Nadab or Abihu from swinging his censer. Let us see, however, whether this has any warrant in the inspired Scriptures.

The first mention we have of anything like the laying on of hands, is found away back at the dawn of God's revelation to man. We find that in the patriarchal period, devout parents practiced this rite as a solemn religious ceremony, whereby they imparted the paternal blessing to their children, and confirmed them in faith and piety.\* When the Old Testament Church was more definitely organized, with a regular priesthood to minister between God and the people, the command was, "Thou shalt bring the Levites before the Lord, and the children of Israel shall put their hands upon the Levites." So, too, when a leader was to be commissioned, as in the case of Joshua, holy

---

\* Gen. xxvii. xlviii. and xlix. chapters.

hands were laid on him by divine command. These are mere instances from the Old Testament history, showing that this solemn rite was kept up as a regular ordinance.

When we come to the New Testament, instead of finding this holy ceremony left behind, we see it carried forward with increased force. Yea, it is under the advanced and enlarged dispensation of the Spirit, that this rite passes more fully into an institution of grace. Our Divine Redeemer, when about to leave His disciples, "lifted up His hands and blessed them." (Luke xxiv. 50.) However significant this act may have been, we do not wish to force it to mean that He laid His hands *upon* His disciples. But if He did not do this, it was for the same reason that he did not baptize. And the reason was this: He was Himself the Author of Life—the very fountain of all grace—and He could, of course, communicate heavenly gifts directly. But, when these were to be bestowed through His disciples to others, there must be some channel of His own appointment, to which they must ordinarily be bound. There must be some golden pipes of the sanctuary, through which the oil is to flow. This is always God's mode of procedure. He gives to His chosen ones first, and then transmits through these, by means which He in His wisdom has seen fit to institute. It is so with Holy Baptism, and it is so with the Laying on of Hands. And we never find the Apostles setting any one apart to any office in the Church, except by the outward act we are now considering. Thus they ordain ministers, and elders, and deacons, and thus they confirm private Christians in the grace of God. The account of the Acts of the Apostles and all their Epistles, are in full evidence on this point.

But let us go back and see the force of all this, the sacred record being our guide. And we may here remark, that the mere blessing of persons and congregations by an official representative of God, *conveyed* a blessing, unless the Word of God says one thing and means another. Thus it was with the beautiful Aaronic benediction, the very form of which God prescribed to be used in the sanctuary. "The Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron and unto his sons, saying,

On this wise shall ye bless the children of Israel, saying unto them, The Lord bless thee and keep thee; the Lord make His face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee; the Lord lift up His countenance upon thee, and give thee peace." Here, when, as we may suppose, the hands were simply upraised over the whole congregation, God pledged Himself that it should not be an empty form. *On this wise* they were to *bless* the people, and the promise to Aaron and his sons in the immediate connection is, "*And they shall put my name on the children of Israel, and I will bless them.*" Those whom God *thus* blessed were blessed, and every believing Jew that came before the tabernacle, felt that he carried away from the altar something that he had not when he went to it.

And a still greater objective force must be attributed to the *Apostolic* Benediction if we admit that it comes to us in the fullness of the new dispensation. It is not a mere wish or even a prayer, much less a mere sentence with which to close religious services. The form is not, as men frequently misquote it, "*May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all,*" as though it were a petition. But it is, using the word reverently, a commanding of the blessing of the Triune God. The grace of our Lord *Jésus* Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost *be* with you all. And if ministers have no better conception of it,—if they must either alter so important a form, or else, not mean what they say, it is no wonder that boys and girls should become old men and women with no other idea of the benediction than that it is a signal to hunt hats and adjust wrappings for an irreverent tread towards the Church doors. Indeed, there is no greater mistake than to suppose that this most important and universally observed act, is merely intended as a proper way to *close* a service. On the contrary, it is a continuation of the service, and means this: Now the grace, love, and communion of God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, which you have received in the worship and transactions here, *be, i. e.,* continue and abide with you. Men are to carry that with them, as something received from God,

just as the Jew did, unless we make the benediction under the New dispensation, something less than it was under the Old. The idea of *ending* in this way the worship which ought to be perennial, seems to link itself either as a cause or effect with the popular notion that our service may be cut off on Sunday evenings, just as the sexton shuts off the gas, to be turned on again when another Sunday comes around. The place given to the benediction in the liturgy of the sanctuary, favors no such view. It involves a bestowal, and one evidence of this is in the fact that by the common law in most Churches, no mere licentiate, no unordained man has a right to pronounce it, any more than he has to perform a marriage ceremony or administer the Holy Communion. *That* authority itself is invested in him only by the *Laying on of Hands*.

To show now that we are not putting too much stress upon the positive force of solemn benediction and the Laying on of Hands, let us recur more particularly to some of the cases mentioned in the Bible, and see what we may learn from them.

Let us take the case of Isaac blessing his sons, the history of which is known to all. The patriarch was old and blind. He was anxious to bless Esau. The mother covered the hands and the smooth part of the neck of Jacob who went to his father and got the blessing; but he had scarcely retired from the tent door, when Esau came, and the deception was found out. Let any one get the twenty-seventh chapter of the Book of Genesis, and read the scene that ensued. It is a piece of dramatic writing, as far above Shakspeare's King Lear, as the heavens are above the earth. Ah, how the old man trembles with indignation and disappointment! How vehement his words! How Esau cries with an exceeding bitter cry, and how piteously he asks, "Hast Thou not reserved a blessing for me?" *Reserved* one? Why not repeat it or recall the one given by mistake the moment before? Given all the circumstances;—the father's blindness, the mother's consummate trick and deception, the father's thwarted wishes, and our modern lawyers would invalidate any mere will ever admitted to record. Why then not sweep to the winds the acknowledged misrepre-

sentations by which the blessing was alienated, and bestow it upon the elder brother? The difficulty in the way must have lain in the fact, that there had gone out to Jacob a positive definite something, which it was impossible to revoke. That formal act had constituted Jacob lord, and no will of the father, no plea of false pretences could make Esau more than a hunter and a servant of his brother.

Another remarkable instance in which the objective force of benediction connected with the laying on of hands is clearly shown, is the account we have of Israel blessing the sons of Joseph. We quote the text, as the shortest way to bring the case before the reader. "And Israel said unto Joseph, I had not thought to see thy face; and lo God hath showed me also thy seed. And Joseph brought them out from between his knees, and bowed himself with his face towards the earth. And Joseph took them both, Ephraim in his right hand towards Israel's left hand, and Manasseh in his left hand toward Israel's right hand, and brought them near to him. And Israel stretched out his right hand, and laid it upon Ephraim's head, who was the younger, and his left hand upon Manasseh's head, guiding his hands wittingly, for Manasseh was the first-born.

\* \* \* \* \* And when Joseph saw that his father laid his right hand upon the head of Ephraim, it displeased him, and he held up his father's hand to remove it from Ephraim's head unto Manasseh's head. And Joseph said unto his father, Not so, my father, for this is the first-born; put thy right hand upon his head, and his father refused, and said, I know it, my son, I know it, he also shall become a people, and he also shall be great; but truly this younger shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations." (Gen. chap. xlviii.)

What a learned man has called the "circumstantiality" of this account is very complete. It may suit the obliquity of some men to waive what is here said aside contemptuously as of no account; but we would remind them, especially, if they are professed modern bibliolaters, that Infinite Wisdom thought it proper and necessary to spread this record before us in all its



details. From that wisdom *we* wish to make no appeal. That *onus* and responsibility rests with those who make the issue with what God Himself has said. We take it as we find it, and are struck with the minuteness of the record. One cannot but observe that Israel perhaps remembering the past, moved his hands very cautiously; that Joseph called attention to the fact that the right hand was on the younger brother, and sought by word and act to make a correction, and that Israel acknowledged the difference this would make, but insisted that what he was doing was a premeditated act. If, however, there was nothing in the laying on of hands, it should have made no difference which hand was upon Ephraim, and which was upon Manasseh, or whether any hand was on either. Some people too, it is true, may be complaisant enough to commiserate these patriarchs as simple-minded old country folks that dwelt in tents, doing their own butchering if unexpected company came, and knowing nothing about Theological Seminaries, Systems of Divinity, Alumni Dinners, and Doctorates, but some of them were princes in prayer, and had mighty faith in God. And be that as it may, if *all* Scripture is given by inspiration, we would be afraid to say that the Holy Ghost moved men to fill the Bible with unmeaning things for our instruction in all after times.

If we pass further on in the Bible history, we will find a more general case in which the laying on of hands constituted a peculiar relation between a whole tribe and the Most High God. We refer of course to the Levites. The command was as we have seen, "Thou shalt bring the Levite before the Lord; and the children of Israel shall *put their hands* on the Levites," and it is added, "*Thus, i. e., in this way* shalt thou separate the Levite from the children of Israel; and the Levites shall be mine. And *after that*, shall the Levite go in to do the service of the tabernacle of the congregation."\* Here the Laying on of Hands was not for a single man as an exceptional case, but it was ordained as a general law for the separation of men to the

---

\* Numbers, viii.

priesthood. With the fate of those who dared intrench upon that holy office, or intrude into holy places, or touch holy things without that solemn separation all are acquainted. Surely, there is everything in these facts to teach us that this rite is no meaningless form, one that God considered not, and man might disregard.

The only other instance in the Old Testament history to which we can now refer, is the case of Joshua. A new leader was to be chosen. "And Moses spake unto the Lord, saying, Let the Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh, set a man over the congregation, which may go out before them, and which may go in before them, and which may lead them out, and which may bring them in; that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep that have no shepherd. And the Lord said unto Moses, Take Joshua, the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay thine hand upon him; and set him before Eleazer the priest, and before all the congregation, and give him a charge in their sight. And thou shalt put some of thine honor upon him, that all the congregation of the children of Israel may be obedient. \* \* \* \* \* And Moses did as the Lord commanded him; and took Joshua, and set him before Eleazer the priest, and before all the congregation, and he laid his hands upon him, and gave him a charge as the Lord had commanded him."\* Here evidently, if words mean anything, God acted through Moses. Although the Spirit was in the son of Nun, yet Moses was to invest him as a leader—put some of his own honor upon him, that the people might be obedient. And we afterwards read, (Deut. xxxiv. 9,) that Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom, *for Moses had laid his hands upon him*. That is a strange reason for the Bible to give, if the laying on of the hands of Moses had nothing to do with it.

It may be asserted, however, by some, that all this is a part of the Old Testament ritual, that has passed away, and does not obtain under the New Dispensation. But if we shall find

---

\* Numbers, chap. xxvii.

this rite recognized, and especially if we find it enjoined and practiced in the New Dispensation, we must concede to a greater objective force, for the new dispensation is by pre-eminence one of realities.

It would be apart from our avowed intentions to enter into any discussion here, in regard to the constitution of the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ. Nor is this at all necessary. It is sufficient for our purpose to know that it is built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone, and that it carries in its bosom the provisions for its own perpetuity. It is not an abstraction, and the grace which bringeth salvation, does not work independently of God's own appointed means. The Apostles never claimed that because they were under a spiritual dispensation, they could do without forms, for upon the very fore-front of that dispensation, the Great Head of the Church had ordained a form. They were to disciple the nations by baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. True to the letter of their commission, we hear one of them saying, "Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost."

But there were various purposes for which the Holy Ghost was given to men, or rather in the language of St. Paul, there were "a diversity of gifts but the same Spirit." Sometimes He was given as it were in advance, for purposes of enlightenment to lead them to God's way of giving them the germ of a new life—to work that repentance and faith through the word, in which any adult must submit to baptism. This is the probable sense in which St. Peter speaks of men having received the Holy Ghost, where he says, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?"\*

Besides this, however, there were purposes of grace for which men received the Holy Ghost which were ulterior to the impartation of the new life in baptism. These were in some in-

---

\* Acts x. 47.

stances for confirmation, and in others to authorize and empower them to perform certain functions in the Church. A most probable case of mere confirmation, is recorded in the eighth chapter of the Acts, in regard to those of Samaria who had not only received the word of God, but been baptized in the name of Jesus. To them and for some especial purpose the Apostles sent Peter and John, who, when they were come down prayed for them, that they *might* receive the Holy Ghost. But did the Apostles regard prayer important as it was, as sufficient? No, for it is added, "*Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.*"\*

This fact was so palpable that "when Simon saw that *through laying on of the Apostles' hands*,† the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost." The Apostle says, "Thy money perish with thee." He would not allow him to suppose that this heavenly power and grace could be made a matter of mere mercantile barter, but he did not intimate that there was no impartation in the solemn laying on of hands. Instead of trying to explain it away as a superstitious notion, he calls it "*the gift of God*,"‡ which no one outside of the sphere of grace—having "neither part nor lot in this matter" and "in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity," could expect to attain.

But the most numerous instances recorded in the New Testament, in which the laying on of hands was practiced, are those in which men were invested with some gift or office to be exercised in the church.

A remarkable illustration of this is recorded in the sixth chapter of the Acts, where we learn that the order of deacons was instituted. "When the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration. Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should

---

\* Acts viii. 17.

† Ver. 18.

‡ Ver. 20.

leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word. And the saying pleased the whole multitude; and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicholas, a proselyte of Antioch; whom they set before the Apostles; and when they had prayed they *laid their hands upon them.*"

Here, it will be observed, that these men are spoken of as already "full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom," and yet their personal piety and prudent judgment was not sufficient to constitute them deacons. There must be an investiture, and this was to be by the Apostles, through the Laying on of Hands. The office here bestowed was not from man, but from God. The words were, look *ye* out among you seven men whom *we* may appoint\* over this business. The multitude selected the men of proper personal qualifications, but the Apostles invested them in this most solemn way.

Again, we read in the thirteenth chapter of the Acts, that "there were in the church that was at Antioch, certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod, the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them."

Here, then, the *Holy Ghost*, instead of authenticating the mission to Barnabas and Saul, by a direct inward enlightenment, independent of the original organization of the church, does His work through men. . . . And *how* do those thus instructed, make missionary elders out of Barnabas and Saul? Do they simply tell them of the call? No. When they had fasted and prayed, and *laid their hands on them*, they sent them away.

---

\* καταρτίσωμεν. More properly whom we may equip or endow.

And how fully God made this official act His own, is evident from the fact that it is added, "So they being sent forth *by the Holy Ghost*, departed into Seleucia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus."

Another instance is found in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts. Paul had come to Ephesus, and found there certain disciples. "He said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what, then, were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then, said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on Him which should come after him, that is on Christ Jesus. When they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus."

But there was more for these men to do, than to live as private Christians. They were to be endowed miraculously for especial missions in the Church. What then? "When Paul had *laid his hands upon them* the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied."\*

Besides all these particular cases, mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, we find this solemn ordinance continually spoken of in the inspired epistles. The Apostles not only performed certain official functions themselves, but committed them to others, as the enlargement or the internal interests of the church demanded this. They never presumed that after the day of Pentecost the Holy Spirit would do its work without the ministry, and they practiced and enjoined this rite as that act by which men were constituted office-bearers in the church. Accordingly, we find Paul writing to Titus, "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city as I had appointed thee."† Yea, they were to *ordain* elders, whose necessary personal qualifications are described immediately afterwards, thus plainly declaring that there must be something superadded to these.

---

\* Ver. 6.

† Titus i. 5.

If, now, as we may infer from all that we have seen, there is any gift of God flowing through this ordinance, we must regard its administration, not simply as an impressive ceremony, but as involving a Divine transaction. Here is a real investiture of heavenly graces and powers, by the Holy Ghost acting in and through this rite. It is an institution in which God acts, bestowing upon those ordained, an official character and authority to be had in no other way. No man can attain to it by mere personal piety or theological learning. He may be as "full of faith and of the Holy Ghost" as St. Stephen was, but if he would be even a deacon in the Church of Christ, he must, in addition to all this, be invested by the *Laying on of hands*. The Apostle speaks of ordained men as those whom the *Holy Ghost* has made overseers of the flock.\* And to this fact he refers and appeals again and again, as if there was something intrinsic, not only to the office thus bestowed, but also to the manner of its bestowal. "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the *laying on of the hands* of the presbytery," he says to Timothy.† And again he says, "Stir up the gift of God, which is in thee, *by the putting on of my hands*."‡ Does this teach that there is *no* gift of God by the laying on of hands, and that Timothy was to stir up that which was not in him? If so, we can insert a negative particle before any inspired declaration, and reverse its true meaning.

The holy Apostle had no such profane idea. He meant what he said. It involved more than his own private opinion, for he spake as he was moved by the Holy Ghost. It was just his sense of what inhered to sacred office in the church, and his realization of what went with the bestowal of it, that made him so cautious in regard to those upon whom it was to be bestowed. A "gift of God," *inverted*, must ever be an awful curse. It is just this consideration that makes him so earnest in describing the qualification of a bishop. Authority and power in the hands of the wicked may be wielded for destruc-

\* Acts xx. 28.

† 1 Tim. iv. 14.

‡ 2 Tim. i. 6.



tion, and the higher and more sacred the function, the more dreadful the ruin. Hence, he tells Timothy that if one is to be chosen a bishop he must be "blameless" . . . "not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil." \* Hence he charges him "before God and the Lord Jesus, and the elect angels," that he should let no mere personal preferences influence him in committing to others what had been committed to him ;—that he should do "nothing by partiality ;" that he should "Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins." †

The warning was not because the Laying on of Hands involved so little, but because it involved so much. As to the positive character of the ordinance itself, the Apostle classes it with the very first principles of the doctrine of Christ—with "repentance from dead works," and "faith towards God," and "the doctrine of baptisms," and "resurrection of the dead," and "eternal judgment." (Heb. vi. 1.) These are things which are at the very foundation of the kingdom of grace. These are in the foundation which only they seek to re-lay, "who, when for the time they ought to be teachers, they have need that some one teach them again, which be the first principles of the oracles of God, and are become such as have need of milk and not of strong meat." ‡ These are the things which we are to leave, as long ago settled, and "go on to perfection." Heb. vi. 1-2.

If, with all this before us, we can say that the Bible tells of no objective force in the *Laying on of Hands* ; we may as well adopt and apply to the Scriptures the maxim of Talleyrand, that "Language is intended to conceal thought."

---

\* 1 Tim. iii. 6.

† 1 Tim. vi. 21-22.

‡ See Heb. v. 12.

## ART. VI.—THE HISTORICAL ARGUMENT FOR INFANT BAPTISM.\*

BY REV. A. B. KOPLIN.

*"As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned."*—Romans v. 12.

JESUS answered, "Verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." St. John iii. 5.

These words set forth very plainly and forcibly, the doctrine of original sin on the one hand, and the necessity of Regeneration, in order to salvation, on the other. What is *born of the flesh is flesh*, and *flesh* cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven.

All are born of the flesh, the infant no less than the adult. Only that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. And only that which is spirit can inherit eternal life. Hence, no one, be he an adult or an infant, can be saved without being *Born again*—Regenerated. The grace of the New Birth is nowhere promised us without holy baptism. On the other hand, our adorable Saviour teaches us, that Regeneration is by baptism, when He says, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." And the Apostle Paul does the same thing, when he says that, "Baptism is the washing of Regeneration, and the washing away of sin."

It necessarily follows from these premises, that infants must be baptized as well as adults. The doctrine of Infant Baptism lies involved in the whole New Testament economy, and it cannot be ignored without doing violence, at once, to the whole scheme of redemption, the testimony of the Scriptures, and the

---

\* I herewith acknowledge the use of "Wall's History of Infant Baptism," "Bingham's Antiquities of the Christian Church," and "Dr. Schaff's History of the Christian Church," in the preparation of this article.

voice of the Church from the time of the Apostles to the present day.

We propose to confine ourself, in presenting the "Historical Argument for Infant Baptism," to the first four centuries of the history of the Church. Not so, however, as to forget to notice at least, the Waldenses, who took their rise about the beginning of the twelfth century, and who were the first sect who denied the doctrine of "Infant Baptism." Then, we propose also to produce the testimony of the Reformers of the sixteenth century, as we have this in the leading Protestant confessions.

Our subject is one that embraces two leading thoughts, namely, Infant Depravity, and Infant Regeneration—Infant Baptism. Then there are two kinds of testimony to be offered, viz.: The Testimony of the Fathers, as this is found in their writings, and the Testimony of the Councils or Synods of the Church. This testimony comes to us, not only with positiveness and clearness, but also with an authority that dare not be ignored, or lightly regarded. It is the same authority which declared to us what is to be our only and infallible rule and guide of faith and practice, and what we are to believe concerning the union of the two natures in the person of Christ, and the person and work of the Holy Ghost.

CLEMENS ROMANUS.

The first of the long line of witnesses that we propose to offer, is Clement of Rome. This Church father was made Bishop of Rome about the year 92. Church history puts the death of St. John at, from 98 to 101. From this it will be seen that Clement held the office of Bishop, at least six years before the death of the Apostle John.

He had, therefore, every opportunity to be perfectly conversant with the apostolic doctrine and practice; being educated for, and set apart to his holy office by them or their co-laborers. Clement, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, and at the 17th chapter, speaking of human depravity, quotes Job xiv. 4, and then says, "Of Job it is thus written, 'That he was just, and

blameless, true, one that feared God and eschewed evil.' Yet he condemns himself, and says, 'There is none free from pollution, no, not though his life be but the length of one day.' " In the next chapter he quotes the 51st Psalm, and where it says, "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me," and then continues, "Let us consider, therefore, brethren, whereof we were made, who and what kind of persons we come into this world, as if it were out of a sepulchre, and from outer darkness." Clement had, indeed, a keen sense of the depravity of man. But he had also the true conception of the atonement, and of the adaptation of the means of grace to the wants of humanity at any stage of life; for he continues, "He that made us and formed us, brought us into His own world, (kingdom) having prepared for us His benefits before we were born." Now we are aware that the words, Infant and Baptism, do not occur in this quotation; but what is of equal force to our present purpose, is contained, viz.:

That the whole human world, from Adam down, is under sin and death, and that the plan of salvation is for the race, and that that salvation is therefore competent to be applied to all, and at any period of life.

Now what does this teach us, if not that Christ died for all, old and young, and that His benefits may be applied to us in our earliest infancy. And this, as we have seen, is promised only in that we are "born of water and of the Spirit." In that we are baptized.

JUSTIN MARTYR.

Next in the order of time comes Justin Martyr. Justin was born towards the close of the first century. He was more than an ordinary man. He is known to have labored in the ministry at Ephesus, and twice at Rome. He closed his last ministry at Rome, by suffering a martyr's death, in the year 166.

During his useful life he wrote a number of books. One of the first of these, is a dialogue with the Jew Trypho, whom he tried to convert to Christianity. This book was written about the year 139; or thirty-eight years after the death of St. John. In this dialogue, Justin, speaking of our Saviour's baptism, at

Jordan, says, "We know that He did not go to Jordan, as having any need of being baptized, or of the Spirit's coming on Him in the shape of a dove. As, also, neither did He submit to be born, and to be crucified, as being under the necessity of those things. But He did this for *mankind*, which by Adam was fallen under death, and under the guile of the serpent, beside the peculiar guilt of each of them that had sinned."

Here most plainly, *humanity* is taught to be under the power of the fall, and of the devil. Of course it is not necessary to say that infants are here included; for, every one that knows anything, knows that infants belong to the human family. At another place, Justin, speaking of circumcision, says, "We also, who, by him have access to God, have not received this carnal circumcision, but the spiritual circumcision, which Enoch, and those like him observed. And we have received it by baptism, by the mercy of God, because we were sinners; and it is to *all persons* to receive it by the same way." Now, let it not be overlooked, that Justin here says, not "*all men*," but *all persons*. And surely no one will say that infants are not persons. Besides all this, it must be remembered that Justin is here writing to a Jew whom he is trying to convert to Christianity, showing him that Christians did not receive the circumcision of the flesh, because they have received baptism instead. What force could such an argument have had with a Jew, if he did not know that baptism was universally administered to infants as well as to adults, as was the case with circumcision?

At another place Justin says, "We are circumcised by baptism, with Christ's circumcision."

In his *Apologia Prima*, an apologetical treatise, wherein he vindicates Christianity over against heathenism, he speaks of baptism as the mystery of regeneration, in the following words, "We bring them to the water, and they are regenerated by the same way of regeneration by which we were regenerated; for they are washed with water, in the name of God, the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost." For Christ says, "Unless ye be regenerated, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Here the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is most plainly taught; and that too, as being necessary for all persons, infants as well as adults. In the same Apology he says, "Several persons are among us, sixty and seventy years old, and of both sexes, who were baptized to Christ in their infancy, do continue uncorrupted." This Apology was written not more than ninety years after the Gospel of Matthew. And Matthew wrote fifteen years after the death of Christ. Hence Justin wrote one hundred and five years after Christ's death. And as we have seen, Justin says, that there were living, at his writing, persons who were baptized in their infancy, and that they were at his writing, sixty and seventy years old. Now subtract seventy, the age of the persons spoken of, from one hundred and five, the number of years from the death of Christ to Justin's writing, and you have thirty-five. Add to this the age of our Saviour when He was crucified, and you have the date of the baptism of the persons spoken of; which is A. D., 68, or thirty-five years after the death of Christ. This proves most conclusively that these persons were baptized (in their infancy) in the middle of the apostolic age. This cannot be gainsaid.

And it is known that a considerable portion of the New Testament Scriptures were not written until after this time. Among the rest of these, we have the Gospel according to St. John, which was written about the year 70, and his three Epistles written between the year 96 and 100, just about one year before his death. Now it is known by every reader of the New Testament Scriptures, that the Apostles, in their Epistles condemned all kinds of sins. And there is no sin that seemed to appear more odious in the eyes of the Apostles than that of heresy. "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject; knowing that he that is such, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself," we hear the Apostle Paul say to Timothy. And can any one suppose that the Apostle John, who was the last eye-witness "of all that Jesus said and did," and who was "that disciple whom Jesus loved," could close his Epistles without giving the veto to a heresy so great as the Baptists would have us to believe the

doctrine of Infant Baptism to be. But while his writings do not contain any condemnation of that doctrine which recognizes the Infant a fit subject for the regenerating grace of Jesus Christ, we hear him say in his first Epistle, chap. ii. 12, "I write unto you, *little children*, because *your sins are forgiven you for His name's sake*." And again, "And now, *little children, abide in Him*." Now remembering that there is no promise of forgiveness without the mystery of baptism; yea, knowing that no one can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, without a death unto sin, and a life unto righteousness, and knowing that the Apostle Paul calls baptism, the "washing of Regeneration, and the washing away of sin," who will say, that these *little children*, whose sins the Apostle says, "*are forgiven*," and whom he exhorts to "*abide in the Lord*," were not baptized? Will he that dares to take the responsibility to say that they were not, please tell us, how the forgiveness of their sins was sealed unto them, and how they came to *be in Christ*, since they are exhorted "*to abide in Him*?" From all this, the apostolic authority of Infant Baptism is established, it seems to us beyond all successful controversy.

## IRENEUS AND CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

Justin Martyr is succeeded by Ireneus and Clement of Alexandria. Ireneus was born between the years 120 and 140. He was a pupil of Polycarp of Smyrna.

In his Refutation of Heretics, written about the year 182, in speaking of Christ, Ireneus says, "He came to save all persons by Himself," and then qualifies his saying thus, "All I mean, who are regenerated unto God, *infants* and little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons." But it may be answered that this quotation says nothing about baptism, but only regeneration. True, but a little farther on in the same treatise, Ireneus settles that matter, when he says, "Regeneration is by baptism." What can be more plainly taught than as Ireneus here shows? the Church, from the Apostles, taught infant regeneration by baptism.



## CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

Clement lived and wrote at the same time with Ireneus, though in a different part of the Church. In giving direction to Christians concerning the gravity and modesty to be used in their apparel, ornaments, and designs engraven on their rings and business seals, Clement says among other things, "If a fisherman will have an engraving on his seal, let him think of St. Peter, whom Christ made a fisher of men, and of children, which when baptized are drawn from the laver." That is, from the baptismal font. Now if infant baptism would not have had a recognized practice at that time, who can tell what would have suggested the carving of such a design on a business seal? This not only shows that infant baptism was universally recognized, but also that it was held in the highest esteem.

## TERTULLIANUS.

We come now to consider the writings of Tertullian on the subject in hand. Tertullian lived about the year 200. He wrote as late as 220. He is the only one of all the early Church fathers who favors the delay of baptism in any case. He takes the position that baptism washes away sin up to the time that a person is baptized, and that sins afterwards committed are not affected by it. At the same time he holds baptism essential to salvation.

This doctrine might do on paper, but certainly, it would be very difficult to carry into successful practice. Owing to his first mentioned view, Tertullian would change the universal custom of the Church, and would delay the baptism of infants, (so long as there is no danger of death,) and also of all unmarried and widowed persons, until they are beyond the reach of the temptations peculiar to them. But because he held baptism to be of indispensable importance to all, he would have none die without it. He says on this subject, "In case of danger of death, baptism should presently be administered to *infants*, and those other sorts of persons, and any person that is present, (whether he be an ordained minister or not,) ought to administer it, or else he is guilty of the person's perdition." Tertullian,

after all has but few followers. The Baptists follow him only half-way. They do not with him acknowledge the validity of infant baptism.

## ORIGEN.

Origen comes next in the order of time. He wrote from the year 210, down towards the middle of the third century. Origen was a man of great learning, and a voluminous writer. On the subject of original sin and infant baptism, he says in his *Homilia in Leviticus*, "Hear David speaking. I was, said he, 'conceived in iniquity and in sin did my mother bring me forth;' showing that every soul that is born in the flesh, is polluted with the filth of sin and iniquity, and that, therefore, that was said which we mentioned before, *that none is clean from pollution, though his life be but the length of one day.*" He continues, "Besides all this, let it be considered what is the reason that, whereas the baptism of the Church is given for forgiveness of sins, infants also are by the usage of the Church baptized; when if there were nothing in infants that wanted forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be needless to them." Origen here teaches us that the Church baptizes infants because she teaches original sin, as so affecting them that they must be born again in order to eternal life. In his *Homily on the fourteenth chapter of St. Luke*, he says again of the same subject, "And it is for that reason, because by the sacrament of baptism the pollution of our birth is taken away, that infants are baptized." Here this same doctrine of original sin and infant baptism go together, not as a new thing, but as the doctrine and usage of the Church.

In his commentary on the *Epistle to the Romans*, he again quotes David, "In sin did my mother conceive me," and then continues, "For this reason also, it was that the Church had, *from the Apostles an order to give baptism even to infants.* For they (the Apostles) to whom the divine mysteries were committed, knew that there is in all *persons* the natural pollution of sin, which *must be done away by water and the Spirit.*" Here then it is declared that "the Church had an order from the Apostles to baptize infants," and that too, by one of the most

learned of the early Church fathers. Now if Origen had been incorrect in this, who will doubt but that he would have been set at rights, by some one of his co-laborers? Ah, these Church fathers all sang the same song.

ST. CYPRIAN.

St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, was born about the year 200, and died a martyr's death in the year 258. Cyprian was the greatest Bishop of the age. It was during the time of Cyprian, that the Council of Bishops met at Carthage. This Council determined a question concerning infant baptism which proves that this doctrine was held in high esteem at that time. But we propose to speak of this in the testimony of the Councils. We shall mention only one of Cyprian's sayings on this subject. It is this. "If any *one* is not baptized and regenerate, he cannot come to the Kingdom of the Lord." Then he quotes St. John, 3-5: "Except *any one* be born of water and of the Spirit," &c. He interprets these words as do all the fathers. Except *a person*, except *one*, except *any one*; and these are the forms of interpretation of these words by all the fathers. Of course he does not say infants, because that would exclude adults; but no one will say that he does not include infants here as clearly as he does females. *Any one*. Are there any limitations in this form of expression? There are none.

GREGORY NAZIANZEN.

We quote now from Gregory Nazianzen's sermon concerning the baptism of St. Basil. In this discourse he makes reference to the prophet Samuel, in these words, "Samuel, among those who called upon the name of the Lord, was both given before he was born, and presently after his birth, was consecrated." He then says of Basil, "And was not this man Basil consecrated to God in his infancy from his birth, and carried to the fount." In his doctrine of baptism, the same author says, "Art thou old, let thy gray hairs hasten thee; strengthen thy old age with baptism. Hast thou an infant child? let not wickedness have the advantage of time, let him be sanctified

from his infancy; let him be dedicated from his cradle, by the Spirit." Again, in the same work, he says, that "infants shall by all means be baptized, though they are not in a capacity to be sensible, either of the grace, or of the need of it." This needs no comment.

## OPTATUS MILEVILANUS.

Optatus, Bishop of Milevi, of this same period wrote a book against the Donatists, in which the subject of baptism is discussed. He quotes the Apostle Paul, where he says, "As many of you as have been baptized in the name of Christ, have put on Christ." Then Optatus continues, "Oh what a garment is this, that is always one, and never renewed, that decently fits all ages and shapes. It is neither too big for infants, nor too little for men."

## BASIL THE GREAT.

Basil the Great was born in the year 329, in Cæsarea. He was distinguished as a pulpit orator, and a theologian. He wrote a number of books, and among them is one which contains a discussion of holy baptism. But owing to its length we will not quote it here, but will present his testimony, given in a more practical way. It occurs in an account of the illness of the only child of the Emperor Valens. This Emperor was an Arian, and persecuted the Catholics, and especially Basil, who was at that time bishop at the capitol. But in his afflictions the Emperor's heart softened, and he sent for Basil to come and pray for his child." The Great Basil went, and coming into the palace and seeing the Emperor's son at the point of death, said "that the child would recover if he had baptism given him at the hands of the godly." But the question may be asked, "Was this child an infant?" Theodoret, who wrote only a short time after, settles this question, when he calls him "*παιδιον*," it being the same word which is used in Matthew ii. 11, to express our Saviour's infancy. This passage shows what high regard was had for the doctrine of infant baptism in the time of Basil.

## ST. AMBROSE.

Ambrose was born in the year 340. It is said of him, that

as a bishop he towered above the contemporary Popes. As a theologian he was counted of the second class. In his work on "The Covenant to Abraham the Patriarch," he quotes St. John iii. 5, and then remarks, "You see He (Christ) excepts no person, not an *infant*, not one that is hindered by an unavoidable accident." In this he agrees with those who wrote before him, as we have seen.

## JOHN CHRYSOSTOM.

This, the greatest of the Greek theologians, was born in the year 347, seven years after Ambrose. It is enough for his greatness to say, "that everything that he preached or dictated was considered worthy of being published." In one of his works he speaks of the advantage of baptism over circumcision, in these words. "But our circumcision, I mean the grace of baptism, gives cure without pain, and gives to us a thousand benefits, and fills us with the grace of the Spirit, and it has no determinate time as that had, (the 8th day) but one that is in the beginning of his life . . . . may receive it."

Here, then, the greatest of the Greek fathers teaches us that the sense of the Church in his day, was that baptism might be given to infants immediately after their birth, and that it need not be deferred until the 8th day, as circumcision was.

## ST. AUSTIN.

We hasten now to consider the testimony of St. Austin, written before the Pelagian controversy. We can, however, make but very short extracts from his writings. These will, however, we think, be found to be very clear and forcible.

At one place where he speaks of the saying of the Apostle, that, "the believing husband sanctifieth the unbelieving wife," Austin says that, "there were in the apostles' times, Christian infants that were baptized, some by the authority of one of their parents, and some by both."

In his work written against the Donatists, he speaks "of persons who were baptized when they were infants." In his epistle to Donatus, he says of the Church, "We affirm that the Holy Ghost dwells in baptized infants, though they know

it not." In his "*Books De Genesi*," *ad literam*, he says, "The infant must be baptized while it is yet alive." "God in His providence," he says again, "does not suffer the infants to die unbaptized, but such as He foresaw would be impenitent if they had lived." "The custom of our Mother, the Church, in baptizing infants, dare not be disregarded," we hear him say at another place.

We might produce a number more of extracts from this same author, that are as conclusive as those we have given, but we do not deem it necessary.

SIRICIUS AND INNOCENTIUS.

Siricius of Rome lived as late as the year 384. In his first epistle, and at the ninth chapter, he says, "He that devotes himself to the services of the Church, ought to be one that has been baptized in his infancy."

So, also, Innocent of the same time writes, "And as to the qualifications of such as are to be chosen into the ministry, there is a certain rule." Not there ought to be, but "there is a certain rule." And that rule is, "that they be such as have been baptized in their infancy." From this it appears that those who were from their infancy dedicated to God, were considered better adapted to the office of the Christian ministry, than those who came into the church in after life.

PAULINUS.

Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, who lived as late as the year 390, had been a heathen man. During this time, as also after his conversion, he showed some skill as a poet.

While Bishop at Nola, Sulpitius Severus built a church, and requested Paulinus to write him a suitable inscription for the baptismal fount. Paulinus complied with his request by sending him the following lines:

"The Priest from the holy fount doth infants bring,  
In body, in soul, in garments white and clean."

At another time he writes to the parents of Celsus, a child which they had lost by death. He consoles them with the following verse:

"So great a favor Christ did to him show,  
That he escaping all the snares below;  
Should, hence, so young and fresh from baptism go;  
Two graces do his *infant* soul commend—  
So little sullied, and so lately cleaned."

Even the Pelagians, who denied the doctrine of original sin, believed in and practised infant baptism. For in their creed, sent by Pelagius to Pope Innocent, in the year 417, this article is contained: "We hold one baptism, which we say, ought to be administered with the same sacramental words to *infants*, as it is to older persons."

In the letter accompanying this creed, Pelagius says, "We do not deny the sacrament of baptism to infants." And, again, "Men slander me as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants." So Celestius, also, "We own that infants ought, according to the rule of the universal Church, and the sentence of the Gospel to be baptized, for forgiveness of sins, because our Lord has determined that the kingdom of heaven cannot be conferred upon any but baptized persons."

This brings us to the close of the fourth century. Here we propose to stop with the testimony of the fathers, and proceed to consider very briefly,

## II.—THE VOICE OF THE COUNCILS.

### *The Council of Carthage.*

The Council of Carthage was held in the year 253, and was composed of 66 Bishops. One Fides, a country Bishop, sent a letter to this Council, which contained two questions on which he desired to be instructed. The one was, "Whether an infant before it is eight days old, might be baptized, or whether the limitation governing circumcision was to be observed." The Council answers this question in quite a lengthy epistle. After saying many interesting things on the subject, they conclude thus. "We are all of the opinion, that if anything could be an obstacle to persons against their obtaining the grace, the adult, and grown, and elder men would be rather hindered by their grievous sins. If then, the greatest offenders, and they that have grievously sinned against God before, have, when



they afterward come to believe, forgiveness of sins, (and no person is kept from baptism and the grace,) how much less reason is there to refuse an infant, who being newly born, has no sin, save that being descended from Adam according to the flesh, he has from his very birth contracted the contagion of the death anciently threatened; who comes for this reason more easily to receive forgiveness of sins, because they are not his own, but other's sins that are forgiven. This, therefore, Dear Brother, is our opinion in the Council, that it is not for us to hinder any person from baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful, and kind, and affectionate to all men. Which rule, as it holds for all, so we think it more especially to be observed in reference to infants and persons newly born, to whom our help and the divine mercy is rather to be granted, because by their weeping and wailing at their first entrance into the world, they do imitate nothing so much as that they implore compassion."

Now it takes only a glance to see that the question here settled, is not whether Infants were to be baptized or not, but rather, whether they should be baptized *before the eighth day*, or whether their baptism was to be deferred until that time, as was the case (ordinarily) with circumcision. That infants were fit subjects for baptism, at least as early as the eighth day, was a doctrine that had universal force. Yes, the infant was universally to be above all others a fit subject for holy baptism, because, though by its birth it "contracted the contagion, the death anciently threatened; yet, has it not added sin to sin by actual transgression."

And now while baptism is regarded, by the early Church, of such awful importance, the Council of Carthage, declares, as the fathers before and after taught, that, "Infants" may be baptized when "*newly born*." What can be more conclusive than this? And it will not do to say that this Epistle is a forgery. It is too well authenticated for that. And let it be remembered that it contains the voice of the Church in her purest days as all must admit.

It can, therefore, not be wiped out by saying that it is a superstition born in the "Dark Ages." It was the voice of the

Church in that period of her history, when men sealed their faith by a martyr's death.

*The Council of Elders.*

The Council of Eliberitanum met in the year 305. The matter that concerns us is found in its 22d Canon, and refers to the course to be pursued in regard to members of the Church who had been led over into the heretical sects, but desired again to return to the Catholic faith. The canon runs thus:—"If any one go over from the Catholic Church to any sect, and do return again to the Church; it is resolved that penance shall not be denied any one, because he acknowledged his fault. Let him be in a state of penance ten years, and after ten years he ought to be admitted to communion. But if they were infants when they were carried over, inasmuch as it was not their own fault that they sinned, they ought to be admitted at once."

Now there is no baptism of these infants here spoken of, we know; but it is nevertheless implied. For they are said to have been carried over *from the Church*. And every one knows that no one was recognized as a member of the Church who was not baptized. And it is not said either or implied that these persons are to be admitted to Church membership, but they are recognized as full members, and are, therefore, without penance, to be admitted to the communion.

*The Council of Neocesarea.*

The Council of Neocesarea, which was held in the year 314, determined at its sixth canon, "that the infant is not affected by the baptism of its mother shortly before its birth, but that such infant must be baptized after its birth. And that when such an infant is baptized, it shall not be considered as twice baptized." What great care the primitive church took, that no child, by any kind of misunderstanding should go unbaptized.

We come now to the Pelagian controversy. During this controversy, a number of Councils were called, the acts of which contain important testimony to the subject in hand.

But as this whole subject was finally settled at the Council of Carthage in the year 418, we will only quote from it. This Council says at its second Canon, "We determine, that whosoever does deny that infants may be baptized immediately upon their birth; or does say, that they are indeed baptized for forgiveness of sins, and yet they derive no original sin from Adam, (from whence it would follow that the form of baptism for forgiveness of sins is in them not true, but false,) let him be anathema. For that saying of the Apostle, By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned, is to be understood in no other sense than as the Catholic Church, spread over all the world has always understood it. For by this rule of faith, even infants who have not yet been capable of committing any sin in their own persons, are in a true sense baptized for forgiveness of sins, that in them what was derived by generation may be cleansed by regeneration."

This Council was called to settle the Pelagian troubles. Pelagius, while he taught that infants ought to be baptized, as he himself says, "Infants ought according to the rule of the Universal Church, and the sentence of the Scriptures, to be baptized for the remission of sins," yet he denied the doctrine of original sin as so affecting them as that they needed baptism on that account. On the other hand, he held that infants must be baptized, because, as he says, "Our Lord has determined that the Kingdom of Heaven cannot be conferred upon any but baptized persons."

As is easily to be seen from the extracts made from the acts of this Council, the Pelagians were not condemned for denying infant baptism, or for calling into question its Scriptural or Ecclesiastical authority, for that, as we have seen, they never pretended to call into question.

The condemnation of the Pelagians was grounded in this. 1st. That they denied original sin. 2d. That they perverted the right sense of the Sacrament of baptism, by teaching that it must be administered for the forgiveness of sins, to those whom they taught, had no sins; and 3d. That they dishonor

the Lord by teaching that He has made it necessary for infants to be baptized for forgiveness of sins, not because they are under sin, but because He saw fit to determine that no person should enter into His Kingdom without being so baptized. Certainly we need not wonder that the Pelagian heresy was anathematized.

This brings us to the close of the fourth century, and here we rest our testimony until we come down to the twelfth century, as it is conceded everywhere, that during these seven hundred years infant baptism had universal recognition. But at the same time, the enemies of infant baptism will have it that it is a heresy that was foisted upon the Church during the "Dark Ages," by some "Papal Bull," (of which no one has ever heard any thing,) in common with all other abuses that crept into the Church during that period. This might do in the absence of the voice of the Early Church, were it not for the following consideration, viz. That the date of the introduction of all innovations of abuses can always be easily given, no matter how "dark" the "ages" were; but who ever found the *day*, or read of the "Papal Bull" in which "Infant Baptism" is announced as a new article of faith and practice, which is to have force in the Church from that date. Read the vocabulary of innovations if you please, but you will not find it there.

Even the Waldenses, who took their rise about the year 1200, never once affirmed that "Infant Baptism" was not always held and practised in the church. And even some of them practised it, while others denied it; and still others of the same general name denied all baptism. The Waldenses did not deny that Infant Baptism had universal recognition in the Church. They acknowledge it; but they would supercede the old doctrine by something they foolishly believed to be better, as is very common with the sect spirit everywhere.

From all that has now been said on this subject, we deduce the following conclusions:

I. That the early Church, from the days of the apostles, ever held the doctrine of Original Sin as affecting the whole race of man, and that from his earliest infancy.

II. That the early Church, from the beginning, held the necessity of regeneration in order to eternal life.

III. That the Church from the days of the apostles, held and taught that "Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration." "Regeneration is by baptism," is her universal voice.

IV. That all of the fathers who make reference to St. John, Chap. iii., v. 5, quote those words, either in one, or all of the following forms: "Except *a person* be regenerated by water and the Spirit." "Except *any one* be regenerated." "Unless ye be regenerated by water and the Spirit, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven." So St. John has it, "Except any one." This, then, embraces all, old and young, "Infants and little ones and elder persons."

So, also, does it speak of but one birth, one baptism by water and the Spirit. It binds the natural and the supernatural. The water and the Spirit.\*

V. That the Church, from the apostles to the end of the fourth century, held the doctrine of "Infant Baptism," and practised it at least as far back as the year sixty-eight; or thirty-five years after the death of Christ. And that, too, before the New Testament Scriptures were all written, and by the sanction of the apostles who were then living.

VI. That the doctrine of "Infant Baptism" was held in high esteem during the whole period of the virgin purity of the Church; never as something new, but always as the old and established doctrine and practice.

VII. That the Church, in order to be true to the Word of God, and the voice of her own history, must ever continue to hold and practise the same.

And it was on this sure foundation of the true faith, that the Reformers of the sixteenth century planted themselves, when they undertook to restore the Church to her own native purity.

---

\* It knows nothing of one "water baptism," and another "Spirit baptism," of which we hear so much in this day. On this subject see Dr. P. Schaff's, "Hist. Christian Church," pp. 91. Also his "Notes on St. John," iii., 5. See, also, Puritanism in general.

Hear their voice as we have this in the leading confessions of the Protestant Church.

Thus says our own time-honored symbol of faith, question 7: "The depraved nature of man comes from the fall and disobedience of our first parents, Adam and Eve, in Paradise, whereby our nature became so corrupt, that we are all conceived and born in sin." At question 8, "We are so far depraved, that we are wholly unapt to any good, and prone to all evil unless we are born again of the Spirit of God." Again at question 73. "The Holy Ghost calls baptism the washing of regeneration, and the washing away of sin," because, "God speaks thus not without great cause; namely, not only to teach us thereby, that like as the filthiness of the body is taken away by water, so our sins, also, are taken away by the blood and Spirit of Christ; but much more, that by this divine pledge and token, He may assure us, that we are as really washed from our sins spiritually, as our bodies are washed with water." And once more, at question 74: "Infants are also to be baptized, for since they as well as their parents, belong to the covenant and people of God, and both redemption from sin and the Holy Ghost, who works faith, are through the blood of Christ promised to them no less than to their parents; they are also by baptism, as a sign of the covenant, to be ingrafted into the Christian Church, and distinguished from the children of unbelievers, as was done in the Old Testament, by circumcision, in place of which in the New Testament baptism is appointed."

The same doctrine is taught by the Anglican Church where it says, "The promises made to adults or grown persons, who voluntarily come up and take their own (baptismal) vows upon themselves, are that they shall receive a new heart, a new and holy nature, through the grace of God's Holy Spirit, and be made members of Christ's body, the Church, of which He is the Head; children of God and joint heirs with Christ of an eternal life of glory in His kingdom." And the same promises are made to children who are baptized in infancy.

The Westminster Confession gives expression to the same historical faith in these words: "Baptism is a sacrament,

wherein the washing with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, doth signify and seal our ingrafting into Christ, and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace, and our engagement to be the Lord's." And, "Infants of such as are members of the visible Church are to be baptized."

The Augsburg Confession joins in this confession of the true faith in these words; "Of baptism they teach, that it is necessary to salvation, and that by baptism the grace of God is offered, and that children are to be baptized, who by baptism, being offered to God, are received into God's favor."

But the enemies of this so firmly established article of Christian faith and practice, will answer to all this unbroken testimony of history, that they go to the "Word," and take their doctrine out of it "pure and simple," without any regard to what tradition may say.

To this whole anti-creed, unhistorical, rationalistic sect spirit, we have only to say that, he who tears himself loose from all past history, and sets up his own judgment against the voice of the ages, is unfit to be the teacher of his fellows in even the most trifling interests of a temporal nature, much less to be a teacher in Israel.

---

#### ART. VII.—THE RELATION OF THE MOSAIC TO THE CHRISTIAN ECONOMY.

*Illustrated by the Pauline Doctrine of Justification by Faith in Jesus Christ.*

BY REV. ADOLPH RAHN, JEFFERSONVILLE, N. Y.

THE Old Testament may be said to hold a negative as well as a positive relation to the New Testament. Everything particularly Jewish and pertaining to the theocratico-national law, and, in connection with this the all-pervading idea of retributive justice in its strictest original sense, forms, so to say, the negative pole which repels the New Testament, and whatever tends to go beyond Jewish particularism, that is everything



prophetical and typical, is its positive pole which attracts the New Testament. These positive elements of the Old Testament economy, being most intimately connected with our Christian Faith, have been by many dogmatical teachers treated by the way of Prolegomena to their dogmatic doctrine or, to express that connection more directly, as part of their Bibliology, under the title of *Theologia prophetica et typica*. But on the other hand, though representing, by way of promise, the New Covenant in the Old one, yet, by their being bound up with Jewish Nationalism or what we have called the negative pole, those same positive elements take on something of a limited character of which they can only be freed when viewed in the light of the New Testament. Their peculiar position, therefore, may be determined as being an intermediate one between both economies, marking the point, on which the Old Covenant of the Law passes beyond itself and ceases to exist and the New Covenant of Grace is typified and promised without being positively given, and so to say, forming the outlet of the Old and the entrance of the New. Corresponding to this position other theologians have given to prophetism and typology a place, not in dogmatical theology, but in that part of Theology which treats of those general principles and leading ideas with which every divine, more or less knowingly, is working and by which it is more closely related to science and speculative philosophy than any other part. For such principles and ideas as are conveyed by the words Revelation, Miracles, Inspiration and also Prophecies and Types, seem to find their proper place in what is called "Evidences of Christianity," or (in German) "Apologetical Theology," meaning a representation and justification of the essence and truth of Christianity before science and reason as they develop themselves in every age and bring on new forms of infidelity. Now then, as long as this outgrowth of infidelity from the worldly sciences and common human reason will recur, and this will never cease, Apologetical Theology will be just as important as Dogmatical Theology, because the intensive and the extensive growth of the Church, that is the ever-growing purity and fullness of the life of Christ in the

Church and its growing extension over all the generations and nations of mankind must always go together, so that, as all educational and missionary efforts serve the latter aim practically, Apologetical Theology does the same as theory and science. By this we wish it clearly to be understood, that the prophetic and typical elements, contained in the Mosaic economy, with which here we have to do, do not strictly belong to the dominion of dogmatics, but are properly a part of Apologetical Theology.

Now this apprehension of those elements has the most immediate bearing upon our question. For our Apologetical Theology is not simply a continuation of the apologetical efforts of the early Church, but is founded on the New Testament itself, on the apologetical tendency and spirit pervading, almost throughout and in the most natural manner, the teachings of the Apostles and those of the Lord Himself. This view of the case is, of course, of the utmost importance, influencing as it does our interpretation of those teachings generally and more especially as they refer themselves to the Old Testament and its relation to the New. This view implies that Christ and His Apostles give themselves such an apologetical position over against their contemporaries and compatriots, the Jews, (as St. Paul also over against the Pagans, Acts ch. xvii.), that they in their teachings have regard to the whole intellectual, moral, and religious state of their hearers, and that they enter more especially into the prophetic and Messianic ideas and notions as they were current among them and founded on the Old Testament Scriptures, in order, by showing their fulfillment in Jesus, to gain and persuade them into faith on Him as the true Messiah and Deliverer. This view forces itself upon our attention in almost any part of the New Testament, and St. Paul himself acknowledges it directly (1 Cor. ix. 19—21; 2 Cor. x. 4, 5; Rom. xvi. 26; i. 2; iii. 21; John iv. 25 f.) Would we overlook or disregard this natural and self-chosen position of the Lord and His disciples, we should tear them out of all the historical relations and associations in which they were placed, and they must necessarily in the same degree cease to

be living historical persons, and the New Testament instead of containing the original facts of absolute divine revelation, must become in our mind a book of dogmatic formulas only. And to that apologetical tendency as we owe to it for instance, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the largest part of those to the Romans and Galatians, so also those rich disclosures which these Epistles give us on the relation in which the New Testament puts itself to the Old. And so it must be our Christian rule to interpret this relation only in the light and from the standpoint of the New Testament. By putting both Testaments on the same line we would disregard the essential difference between both. (2 Cor. iii. 6-11; Heb. viii. 6-10). But as the dogmatical comprehension of the Old Testament prophecies and types must be ruled by the New, so, on the other hand, a historical comprehension of the New Testament is only possible by a historical interpretation of the Old.

For the true task which is to be solved in determining correctly that relation can be no other, than to point out distinctly at the side of the primitiveness and absoluteness of divine revelation in the New Covenant—to give up this primitiveness would be to give up the essence of Christianity, itself the continuity of divine revelation, its gradual development through the preliminary stages; to disregard this continuity would be to disregard the unity and eternity of the divine will and counsel, and would endanger our idea of God. Now, if this continuity is shown by the law and the prophets, and if by this idea is expressed the true sense and the full weight and importance of these positive elements of preliminary revelation, and if, on the other hand, the absolute primitiveness of divine revelation in Christ, as the new spiritual creation of mankind through Him, must be adhered to, the question will always be, to find out a correct and valid measure by which those elements may be estimated at their true value and by which the extent may be determined to which they must be permitted to influence our theological thinking. But it is a task which, as it is perhaps the highest and most important of Apologetical Theology, is also a most delicate and difficult one, to the solution of which

we can only come nearer by slow degrees and by sincere researches often repeated. For it is in the nature of the case, that here, as everywhere, human fallibility will miss the right measure, driving some into one extreme and others into the opposite one-sidedness. For those who, before all, wish to assure themselves of the continuity of divine revelation will also be inclined to make the utmost of everything that seems prophetic and typical in the Old Testament, as if they felt themselves certain of Christ only in the measure they can find Him typified and prophesied, even in minute particulars of His life. But they must be warned, first, that the more this is their case the more it proves that their faith is so much less based upon what a true living faith must and ought to be based, that is, upon the immediate revelation of God unto the soul (Gal. i. 15, 16; Matt. xvi. 17), mediated by the beholding of Christ (St. John i. 14; iv. 42). In producing this impression and effect centres the prophetic office of Christ, and the apologetical elements of the law and the prophets He Himself employs only for the purpose of combating or gaining those who were not inclined to believe on hearing or beholding Him. So all those whose faith has not this inner self-certainty in Christ draw so much the more on the prophecies, in order to rest upon them their faith. Secondly, they must be warned, that, if they do not content themselves to find a correspondence between prophecy and fulfillment in those essentials which represent a real value for the work of redemption by Christ, but try to find the same more especially in as many accidentals as possible which are indifferent for redemption, they will scarcely escape the danger of falling down from the vivifying spirit into the "killing letter," (2 Cor. iii. 6), and from a living faith into trifles. And lastly, they must be warned, and this is the point with which we have to do here, that, after all they will make appear Christ as the mere product of Judaism and the New Testament as an appendix to the Old, and that, by so making doubtful the originality of Christianity, its purity will be endangered, that is Judaized.

On the other hand those, who, wishing to escape the extrem-

ity which we have spoken of, and the errors consequent upon it, bear in mind that the essence of Christianity rests upon the primitiveness and absoluteness of divine revelation in Christ, are apt to disregard the continuity in revelation and, thereby, to endanger the eternal unity of the divine counsel of redemption. For either the ultimate aim of the divine will and counsel is, to reveal itself as the redeeming love and wisdom in establishing the Kingdom of God through the eternal Son, and the creation and government of the world tends to that ultimate aim, or it is not so. With those, who take the latter, negative position, we can, of course not have to do here, because it denies the divine origin of Christianity, but only with those who affirm that assertion, but with the restriction that in the divine counsel, Christian revelation stands in no closer connection with that of the Old Testament, than with the general revelation of God in nature and heathenism. But they must be warned, first, that they will be bound to prove, to historical evidence, either that that grandest fact in the Old World's history as it is, on the one hand, the natural and most spiritual product of the Mosaic legislation, and, on the other, a distinct expression as well of the divine promise as corresponding to it, of the expectation of the creature, of the longing and aspiration of human nature after deliverance, we mean the Hebrew Prophetism, is nothing better than heathenism, or that heathenism itself offers indeed the same grand revelation element. In this task of degrading prophetic Judaism to heathenism, or screwing up the latter to the first, they can, of course, never succeed, unless they do away in the most willful manner with the facts of history. Secondly, they must be holden to prove that Christ having been born an Israelite, has nothing to do with God's counsel, but is simply accidental; that, (to speak in the words of the Apostle, Rom. ix. 4, 5), "He came concerning the flesh from the fathers of the Israelites, to whom pertain the covenants and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises," means nothing, and, moreover, to prove concerning the same historical origin of Christianity, that Christ would have found His chosen organs for establishing His Kingdom, the

Apostles, just as well among the heathens as among the Israelites, that, therefore, there was no need for God to ordain and prepare that "fullness of the time," by dint of which He who was made under the law might find natures susceptible enough to receive Him and to be formed by Him into His disciples, that is, such men and women who were waiting for the consolation of Israel, or looking for redemption in Jerusalem, (Luke ii. 25, 38,) or who were prepared to say, (St. John i. 41, 45,) "We have found the Messias." And as they cannot succeed in such an attempt without tearing and annihilating the primitive history of Christianity, so they must be warned, thirdly, that they admit an element of arbitrariness and accidentalness into their idea of God, which cannot fail to make this idea anthropopathical, and to endanger our idea—which concerns us here especially—of the unity and eternity of divine counsel. For this we can only maintain in a revelation developing itself historically.

If, then, each of these two extremes is equally dangerous, the question arises, whether there is any rule, guide, or law, according to which we can avoid them, and this law must be some such measure as we have hinted at above, and it should be one, to which all would agree. And even this, to set up such a measure, forms the peculiar difficulty of the apologetical task, to the solution of which we can only claim to offer a very modest contribution in saying, that the measure must lie, somehow, in the mutual relation of those two fundamental principles, the continuity of divine revelation, and the primitiveness of the revelation in Christ, as the new creation. That is to say, the latter principle must always guide us in the teleological interpretation of preliminary revelation, so that in the light of absolute and ultimate revelation we may recognize, what elements in the first, and how far they have a real and essential bearing upon the latter; and the continuity principle must make us understand, in a historical way, the eternal sameness of divine revelation, so that even the new creation is shown to be founded in the eternal divine will and counsel. By so combining both principles, and by limiting each way of interpretation to its

allotted place, we shall have a rule, which may, indeed, be employed differently, according to individual inclinations, but it will, at least, be a monitor, "to prove all things and to hold fast that which is good," and so bring us nearer to the knowledge of evangelical truth, which is the aim of all theological inquiry. For in making a conscientious use of our rule, we shall know how to distinguish between historical and dogmatical or teleological interpretation, and to find out, how far this or that phenomenon or fact, related in the Old Testament, must be taken in a historical sense, expressing an element of human imperfectness, or in a teleological sense, as expressing an element of divine revelation. Mingling up one with the other can never fail to mislead to wide aberrations from truth. To illustrate our rule in this regard, an example from the New Testament may be cited here. The Apostle Paul, (Rom. ch. iv. ; Galat. ch. iii.,) represents the belief of Abraham as the type of Christian belief, in so far as Abraham's belief stood in the same relation to the divine promise as ours to the fulfillment. This, according to the Apostle, is the historical fact. And what teleological sense does the Apostle mean to convey by this fact? This, that the divine promise, given to Abraham and fulfilled in Christ, had such reference to the fulfillment in the divine counsel. Now if we would add, that the same reference was also in the consciousness of Abraham, so that to him the promise was actually the same thing, as to us is and must be the fulfillment, then we would fall into the error of taking a teleological element for a historical fact, as we would also contradict the whole purpose of the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, and also what Christ Himself says, (Luke x. 23, 24.) This example may, indeed, be taken as a type of how we may recognize in a fact, given in the Old Economy, a revelation-element without exalting the Testament of promise to the Testament of fulfillment by tearing such fact, in an unhistorical way, out of its temporal, local, and personal limitation, and so identifying it with the infinity and eternity of the divine counsel itself.

To represent, according to the principles given above, the re-



lation of the Mosaic to the Christian Economy in its entirety, is, as we have said, the most important task of Apologetical Theology. Here our object could only be, first, to set down those principles, though in an outline, yet in such a way, that they might claim assent, and then to illustrate them by a subject, which must always claim our especial attention. This subject, the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith in Jesus Christ we have chosen, because it became, from the beginning, the central material dogma of the Reformation, as the normal authority of the Scriptures became its formal dogma, and because it has exerted and will always exert, with all Protestant Divines, a most determined influence upon their interpretation of the Scriptures, and especially so with regard to the relation of the two Testaments. Moreover, the doctrinal method of the Apostle Paul has such a general significance, that it can never cease to be typical in Christian theology. For as we may distinguish in the New Testament two stages in shaping the Christian doctrine, one more popular and, at the same time, more Judaizing, with the synoptical evangelists, St. James and also St. Peter, and another more scientific and, apparently more anti-Judaizing, so the latter is marked by two different types, supplementing each other, the Johanneic and the Pauline. St. John proceeds in a speculatively theological way, beginning with the "Logos." St. Paul in a contemplatively anthropological way, beginning with his personal experience of the Gospel as "the power of God unto salvation." This difference goes through all their teachings and touches also their anti-Judaizing utterances, St. John combating, objectively, the enmity of the Jews against the Son and the Father, while St. Paul is always fighting, subjectively, with the vain righteousness by deeds of the law. As now each of these two doctrinal types, which will never cease to exist together in the Church, has its own preference, the preference of the Pauline stand-point is, that, being rooted entirely in faith, in a living experience of Christ, and so inviting us, unceasingly, to examine and to prove what is in consonance with "Christ in us, the hope of glory," and what not, it will the most securely guard us from mixing

up our doctrine with either philosophical speculations or dead traditions; and so it is peculiarly well adapted to show how far anything, which in the Old Testament offers itself as a revelation-element, may have this value, that is, represent a positive reference to the work and plan of redemption or not.

The position the Apostle takes in relation to the economy of the law and the prophets is known to be laid down with an especial dogmatic explicitness in the first eight chapters of the Epistle to the Romans and in that to the Galatians. The theme he proposes to expound to the Romans he lays down Rom. i. 16, starting from his own energetic Christian self-consciousness of the Gospel of Christ, in the words, "that it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek;" but forthwith, remembering that he has to deal now more particularly with the Jews, he gives his theme, v. 17 this apologetically modified turn: that therein is the righteousness of God revealed (meaning the divine activity or the creative "power of God" unto salvation), from faith to faith (meaning the human activity in the process of salvation or redemption.) In calling the divine power unto salvation the divine revelation of righteousness, he makes the central idea of the Jewish also the central idea of the Christian religion; but in adding the moment of human activity "faith in Christ" purposes to combat and to entirely negative that central idea of Judaism in the form it was prevailing among the Jews, in order to elevate the idea of righteousness to its true conception. So, then, the Apostle's apologetical theme implies a negative and a positive.

To follow him first in his negation of Jewish righteousness, we must see, from his own stand-point, in what sense this idea was the centre of the Jewish Theology. To Israel being called and chosen to be the people of God, was given the law as the expression of the holy, divine will, not, indeed, "written in their hearts," as was promised (Jer. xxxi. 32,) for the new covenant, not as an inner principle which enlivens the will and fructifies it, but as a letter which exhibits itself in a multitude of commandments, prescribing for man his several actions, so

that, as the divine will is not man's own indwelling ethical impulse and motive power, the divine will and the human will are in opposition to each other. The impulses and affections of the human will are, on the contrary, selfish and sensual motives. The consciousness of this inward contradiction pervades the whole law, and finds an expression in the direct acknowledgment of those motives by promising earthly blessings for obedience and threatening punishment and curses for disobedience (comprised in Deut. ch. xxviii.) so that the law itself does not constitute the divine will as the governing motive of men, but on the contrary, fears and hopes, likes and dislikes. So then, the essential relation between God and man, as it is represented by the law itself, comes out to be an entirely legal one and like a compact (covenant), by virtue of which God is the King and Lord and the people His servants and subjects. They are mutually plighted to each other, God to reward and bless man's obedience to the law, as He is also in His right to punish man's disobedience—and, therefore, the essential quality of God is His righteousness, that is, retributive justice; and man is plighted to full obedience or accordance to the law in all his actions—and therefore, the essential quality of man is also his righteousness. In this twofold sense, partly referring to God partly to man, and yet being one as meaning conformity to the law which is the whole intent and purpose of the covenant, *righteousness* is the highest and all-pervading idea of Judaism and the summum bonum of the Jew. And this is the reason for which the Apostle also makes, in his own sense, righteousness by faith in Jesus Christ, the leading idea of his doctrine. For he knows, that in the idea of righteousness, taken in its true sense, there is hidden something far more deep and far more essential than that righteousness of the law, and that there is even in the law itself, and much more yet in those inspired expounders of the law, the prophets, a distinct foreboding of that perfect and true righteousness, and that this foreboding accompanies from the very beginning and steadily the consciousness of that limited and imperfect righteousness and develops itself, from time to time, to clearer conceptions, and so he feels out,

we may say, the positive pole of the Mosaic economy which attracts him and leads him to show the continuity of divine revelation.

But, before taking up this positive element, he, as we have indicated, negatives entirely the prevailing idea of righteousness as it is the mere purpose and result of the law-covenant, that is "righteousness by the deeds of the law" or man's "own righteousness." "That by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified" (Rom. iii. 20,) he proves first (Rom. ii. 1-3, 19,) from the real facts of experience, that the Jews just as little as the Greeks have kept the law, bearing down every imagination of righteousness flowing from that national pride which appealed to the covenant, circumcision and giving of the law, by the assertion (given from the stand-point of the law itself,) that not the hearers but the doers of the law shall be justified, and not outward circumcision, but the inward of the heart constitutes the true Jew whose praise is of God. But the Apostle does not content himself with this, so to say, statistical proof; he considers it himself only as preliminary, because it does not disprove the possibility of keeping the law, and if it were the case that any mere man could fully conform to it, the law-covenant would continue to stand in its right. Therefore he goes on to prove the impossibility of conforming perfectly with the law, and implicitly, the necessity of a righteousness different from that by the works of the law. This principal and dogmatical proof he furnishes in that grand and energetic argumentation which we find Rom. ch. vii., based on his view of the true nature and divine destination of the law as well as the true character of human nature for which the law was given. Of which argumentation we put together, for our object, the following propositions, contained in Rom. viii. 14; Gal. iii. 21; Rom. iii. 20, vii. 3-10; Gal. iii. 10, 23, 24; Rom. vii. 24, 25.

First, The law is spiritual, holy, just and good, and man consents unto the law that it is good; it is, therefore, not a mere knowledge of the understanding of what is good; on the contrary, to will is present with me, and so the law constitutes the better part of my human nature, it is, so to say, my ideal

self (vii. 20), for I delight in the law of God, after the inward man (v. 22). But the other part of my nature, my real self which performs the actions I do, is carnal, sold under sin, and sin is the actually operative principle in me, that is, in my flesh. And these two principles, the flesh and the spirit, which constitute human nature, are in war with each other (Gal. v. 17).

Secondly. Now if there had been a law given which could have given life (like the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, Rom. viii. 2), verily righteousness should have been by the law. But such law has not been given to man: the law is weak through the flesh. My ideal self or my inward man consents unto the law and wills it, but does not find how to perform it, and the carnal self conquers in that contest. This he states here simply as a fact to the truth of which every man's consciousness must give immediate assent, though elsewhere (Rom. v. 12-19), he indicates clearly enough the origin of this state of things.

But Thirdly, what follows now from this peccability of human nature under the law or the weakness of the law through the flesh, as to the divine and final destination of the law? Certainly this, that the final destination of it cannot lie in the law itself, though it be good in itself, but in the effect it produces in man and is intended to produce, this effect being twofold and yet essentially one, namely to make man sensible even of that inner contest and contradiction in which his nature, in the state of law, is involved (Gal. v. 17), that is, on the one hand, to make him fully conscious of sin (Rom. vii. 7, 8), to make sin appear what it is, working death in me and becoming exceeding sinful (v. 13), and at the same time, on the other hand, to make man feel the necessity of a righteousness different from that of the law, a righteousness that might make him free from the law of sin and death, with one word, an overbearing longing for one, "who shall deliver him from the body of this death." (Rom. vii. 24, 25).

So then, the Apostle deduces even from his refutation of the righteousness by the law the indispensable necessity of the law in the divine order of things. "To Abraham and his seed

were the promises made" (Gal. iii. 16), and "the law was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made" (v. 19), so that the law is not only "not against the promises of God," but is an indispensable institution, under which we must be kept, "shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." The true purpose, therefore, and distinguishing character of the law, as a most essential and positive element of divine revelation, is to be "our pedagogue (to bring us) unto Christ."

And this position of the law must explain, in which sense St. Paul confesses, at one and the same time, to the abrogation of the law and its perpetual validity; it is abrogated for all those who are in Christ; it remains valid, a preliminary divine institution, for all those who are yet without Christ.

In passing over now, from the Apostle's negation of righteousness by the law, to his position of righteousness by faith in Jesus Christ, our object can, of course, not be, to find it fully embodied in the Old Testament. The Apostle himself does not do so, and we would contradict our own principles and lower down Christ to become a mere product of Judaism and a servant of circumcision, but only to see, which are the positive elements in the prophets (in the wider acceptance of the word, comprising also Job and the Psalms) and, perhaps, in the law itself, that indicate, prognosticate, presage the true righteousness. For as we detect such elements, we take them for true elements of divine promise or of preliminary revelation.

Now as to the first divine promise, made unto Abraham, we have seen already, in what sense the Apostle has taken it up. Here we have to do with those elements which come after or with the giving of the law and are based on it. And we may, clearly enough, from that time forward, in Prophecy, regarding the development of the religious idea of true righteousness, distinguish the following stages or moments which form the prophetic precedents of the apostolic idea.

The first stage is an attempt to supply the deficiency of man's own righteousness, by a righteousness which is the free

gift of God's grace. For as soon as man became conscious of so many transgressions of the law, the idea of absolute retributive justice, as punishing every transgression of every man, would not satisfy the religious consciousness of man. And as this was the case from the very beginning, the law itself provides for this deficiency by establishing (Levit. iv.) the sin-offering for sins through ignorance, and as it depended entirely on the free-will of God to accept such supplement or not, the sin-offering was an appeal to God's grace and mercy. And to connect this latter idea with the idea of retributive justice was now a necessity, and this is done in the following manner: As, in accordance with retributive justice, earthly prosperity is the reward for righteousness, and misfortunes or sufferings of any kind are the punishment for sin (Ps. i. 6.), man, so far as he is conscious of his own righteousness, reasons this way: "I am righteous, therefore hath the Lord recompensed me according to my righteousness" (Ps. xviii. 20, 24); but so far as he is conscious of his sin, he makes the conclusion his premise and argues: "As I am in prosperity, God accepts me as righteous," or, "As that man is in misfortune, he must be a sinner," (St. John ix. 2.) That is, in the first and in the last case the righteousness of God appears as retributive justice, but in the second case as mercy. And so it comes, that the word righteousness (*Zedek-zedakah*), which means originally, on the part of God His retributive justice, and on the part of man his conformity to the law, signifies now, also God's mercy and man's prosperity or his God-gifted righteousness; and these four ideas have become so correlative in the prophetic mind, that they meet each other in one and the same word, so that, generally, only the connection or the suffix pronoun can decide, which of them is, in a given passage, the prevailing one. It is quite superfluous to quote examples, as they are very numerous, yet the following may be adduced as instances from the one, Isaiah xli. 10; lxiii. 1; xlv. 19; xlvi. 13; li. 6, 8; lvi. 1; lxii. 1; liv. 17; xlv. 25.

A second stage in the development of the idea of righteous-



ness is marked by opposing to the doctrine of retributive justice the fact of experience, that, on the contrary, the ungodly often prospers and the righteous is unhappy. This fact awakens doubts and diffidence as to God's justice, (Ps. lxxiii. 2, 14,) which the Psalmist (v. 15, 17) tries to assuage by the consideration (v. 18, 20), that the prosperity of the wicked is of no durability, and that God, after all will sustain the righteous. Similarly, Ps. xxxvii., Ps. i. and others. From the same stand-point we find the Book of Job reflecting upon that contradiction between the idea of divine justice and the facts of experience, and it is the theme of that deeply religious book to attempt to solve that contradiction. And it succeeds, indeed, in destroying the prevailing doctrine of retributive justice as untenable, but as to establishing another one in its stead, more tenable, it limits itself to the appeal to trust and have faith in the unsearchable wisdom of God, whose final purpose in making the godly suffer is indicated to be trial and discipline. Hereby the Book of Job marks an important progress in the development of Mosaism, and has taken in a New Testament element, of which our Apostle makes frequent use, as for instance Rom. v. 3, 5; but just because Job does not know redemption and peace with God through Jesus Christ, in which alone we may glory in tribulation, he cannot come to a full solution of the divine mystery, though his "unsearchable wisdom of God" stands there as a presage of the true righteousness of God.

These attempts of the religious mind of Judaism, to raise its central and governing idea to its own true conception, must necessarily fail, because the mind did not raise itself, at the same time, above the standard of sensualism and selfishness to a higher truly ethical standard. From their more ideal anticipations of divine justice, they recurred always to that limited idea which was the prevailing one, that God's righteousness realizes itself in distributing to every individual man, according to his merit, prosperity or unhappiness. But, as attempts, they were preparing that way for the last and highest development of the central religious idea of Judaism. Even

that fact which Job opposed to the dogma of retributive justice, the fact of the unhappiness of the godly, should lead to a higher apprehension, by stripping it of its limited reference to the individual man alone whom the punishment falls upon, and by referring it to the community of which he is a member. Had the law been given, originally, to every single Israelite in his individual capacity? Had it not been given to Israel, who, even by virtue of the legislation, became the holy federal people of God, embodying a unity of religious life and comprising every individual Israelite as a living member of the religious body, and in no other quality than in this of his membership? The higher apprehension, therefore, to which the religious mind is being led, on this last stage, is that the proper subject, on which the righteousness of God reveals and realizes itself is not individual man in his singleness, but, on the contrary, first, the general or common life of the federal people as an organic unity, and then, at the same time of course, by virtue of the solidarity which comprises the single individuals in the whole, and makes both, the whole and the individual, mutually responsible for each other, becomes the individual member, as an integral part of that organism, the object of divine justice. So, then, prosperity and happiness are common to all, and the suffering of each individual is only his participation in the common suffering which he has to bear. On this stand-point, therefore, the measure of suffering, which divine righteousness deals unto this or that man, can no more be taken as the positive measure of punishment for a positive measure of sins committed by him as an individual, but, on the contrary, the purest and best may be befallen by the greatest sufferings, in order that by them, as the purest representatives of the generality and chosen organs of God, the guiltiness and sin of all might the more clearly appear, because just in the purest and holiest there is the deepest and liveliest consciousness of sin; and in order that from them, the chosen sufferers, the same consciousness, and with it repentance, might spread to all, because hereby God's justice will be satisfied and men's righteousness established so far as the suffering of those chosen

sufferers becomes theirs by virtue of the ethical unity of their life.

In this last stage of development, then, Judaism, in attempting to solve the mystery of righteousness, produces the idea of vicarious suffering or *satisfactio vicaria*, as one of the most specifically positive elements of preliminary revelation, and preparing the way for our Apostle Paul's Christian idea of righteousness by virtue of the vicarious suffering of Christ.

And in two forms it appears in the Old Testament. First, in a symbolical shape in the law itself, as given Levit. iv. For the idea of the sin-offering," the law of which is given there as an especial revelation, distinct from that of the other offerings, Levit. i. ii. iii. and which more properly singles out from all other nations the holy people of the holy God, is, to atone the people and its members for their punishable transgressions to the Lord by a vicarious death (therefore the recurring formula iv. 20, 26, 31, 35; v. 18). For intentional theocratical transgressions the life of the perpetrator was forfeited, but for transgressions through ignorance God would accept a vicarious death, and according to the magnitude of the sin, which itself was graduated according to the theocratic position (1. Priest and congregation; 2. ruler; 3. any of the people), should be the magnitude of the victim, (1. bullock; 2. male goat; 3. female goat) and the application of its blood (in the most holy, or in the holy or before the tabernacle). But all these differences pervade the one idea, that the blood and life of the victim—it is always a domestic animal, which is most intimately interwoven with the life of man and its affairs, is preserved by him and forms a part of his existence—should answer for the blood and life of man which was forfeited by sin, and be accepted by God as an atonement. And this idea finds its highest expression in the yearly feast of the expiations partly through the greater solemnity and multiplicity of the ceremonies, partly through adding a new element of a peculiar and momentous character, that is, the sending of the live goat, after putting all the iniquities of the children of Israel upon his head, into the wilderness. This symbolical act, which is

quite peculiar to the Jehovah religion and finds no parallel in any of the old religions, refers not immediately to atonement, but expresses the removal of sin from Jehovah's land and people. That is, in the idea of sin-offering as a vicarious atonement enters, as essential, the moral or ethical element of taking away sin itself, with the import, that the atonement or extinguishing the consciousness of sin can only be fully realized in the removal of sin itself. Therefore, as the sacrifices of sin are performed by the high-priest, as the theocratical head of the congregation of Jehovah, and as the most pure and holy representative of it, so it is the same and in the same capacity, who sends the *hircus emissarius* into the wilderness, that is through his action the congregation itself confesses to do away its sins.

So, then, we find, even in the law itself, typified the New Testament justification by faith, and not only in that abstract sense which separates the vicarious death of the victim, from the moral element of taking away sin itself, as if the first could bring atonement without the latter, but in that full and real sense, in which the Apostle Paul (chapters vi-viii. in Romans) lays all possible stress on the newness of life, on the being made free from sin, on the actual righteousness, worked in us through Him who was delivered for our offences.

But, though we take the sin-offering and the great feast of the expiations, to be a typical expression of the religious chief idea of our Apostle, in themselves they have only a symbolical value, and, as mere symbols, are exposed to the danger of abuse, and, therefore, they are deprecated in the Prophets and in the Psalms. But, if in the sin-offering, the vicarious suffering and death is only symbolized, do we not find also in the Old Testament, an actual, real vicarious suffering and death, namely, in the "Servant of the Lord," as the Prophet represents Him, Isaiah lii. 13—liii. 12, (cf. xlii. 1-7, xlix. 1-9)? "The Servant of the Lord," says the Prophet, v. 4, 9, "hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows," that is, the punishment for sin fell upon Him who did not deserve it, and not upon those who deserved it, He had to answer for the sins of all the people, by

His vicarious suffering. This we had not known nor believed, on the contrary, "we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted," that is, we deemed Him to be a penitent whom God's justice had punished for his own sins, (just the idea which his opponents cherished of Job). But (v. 5) just the reverse is the case, He had to bear the punishment of our sins for our rest and our peace. He, "my righteous servant (v. 11) shall justify many, for He shall bear their iniquities," and (v. 12), "He bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors." An idea which Job, on his stand-point, did not comprehend. This idea, that the just is suffering punishment for the unjust, implies that, in His punishment the punishableness of all should the more clearly appear, and that, as only in the most just and pure is the most lively consciousness and hate of sin, He, by His suffering punishment for the others, might, by virtue of the ethical life-community between the head and the members, awaken in them the same consciousness and hate of sin, so that, positively, His own life and righteousness may become theirs, and He, as their true priest, make intercession for them. For making intercession is part of the priestly office, and so the Prophet elevates the idea of the sin-offering and the idea of the priestly office, as we have found them above in the law, to their deepest and truly New Testamentary conception, in representing the true high-priest, the theocratical head of the congregation, the holy among the sinners, as offering Himself for them, and hereby making an intercession which is not symbolical, but real and consequential, in so far as He imbues the members of His congregation with His life, and God now sees them, and is pleased with them, through Him. Then, again, by ascribing to "the Servant of the Lord," the office of justifying many by His knowledge, (v. 11), and by letting rest upon Him the Spirit of the Lord, He ascribes to Him also the prophetic and the spiritual kingly office, whereby He is indicated to be the Mediator of the New Covenant, (Jer. xxxi. 31-34). And that this new process of justification is performed in man on condition of his faith, is the unconditional and self-understood pre-supposition which lies at the basis of it.

Now, from this simply historical interpretation of the central religious idea of the Old Testament, as it appears in its latest stage of development, it is very clear, that all the essential moments of our apostolic doctrine, are contained in it, and, more especially and positively, in the idea of the person and office of the Servant of the Lord. It will not be necessary to show this in particular. It will only be necessary for those who wish to do it, and neither find more nor less in the Old Testament, than the apostle himself, to look at it with his eyes. That is, in combining his expositions in Romans and Galatians in one living intuition, we shall not, in an abstract manner, separate the divine activity in justification from the human activity, or the application of it by faith; we shall not separate, in the same manner, the high-priestly vicarious suffering and death of Christ, from His high-priestly, sinless person, life and work, nor part, in our living faith in him, the remission of sin from the removal of sin; not disconnect our dogmatical from our ethical consciousness, and not forget, that, in the view of the Apostle, the actual historical Christ is more than the Prophets, even in their most inspired moments, could anticipate; that they, in their idea of the Messiah, always being tied to the Jewish national Theocracy, could never reach his idea of "the Son of God," which was "revealed unto him," not by the Prophets, but by the Son Himself, and that Isaiah's "Servant of the Lord," or Daniel's "Son of man," does not come up to his "Second Adam," as the archetype of the new man, (Romans, chap. v.)

And so the Apostle himself leads us back to our principle, that, if we would prove the continuity of divine revelation, by establishing the positively preparatory elements of the Old Testament, we must never go so far as to identify both Testaments, because, by such a course, we cause the preliminary revelation to become absolute, and the revelation in Christ its after-growth, and by taking the prophetic ideas, as our full measure for Christ, we reverse, exactly, the case, and shall cease "to receive grace and truth from His fullness."

If we should try to express, in one formula, as strict as pos-

sible, the whole relation between the Mosaic prophetic, and the Christian revelation, we would say, that in the first there is the highest measure of susceptibility, or receptivity for the divine Spirit; and in the latter the full measure of spontaneous productiveness, so that, as to the essence and substance, the spirit is the same in both, and hereby, Judaism, distinctly separated from all Paganism, but, as to the full vitality of that spirit, Judaism is only the prophetic longing and aspiration for it.







Rev. T. G. Apple.  
VOL. V.

NEW SERIES.

NO. 1.

THE  
**Mercersburg Review;**

AN ORGAN FOR

CHRISTOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL AND POSITIVE THEOLOGY.

EDITED BY

**T. G. APPLE, D.D.,**

PRESIDENT OF MERCERSBURG COLLEGE, MERCERSBURG, PA.

Veni Christus Jesus Agminis noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia  
in seinet ipsum recapitulans.—IRENEUS.

VOLUME XVIII.

JANUARY, 1871.

PHILADELPHIA:

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD.

54 NORTH SIXTH STREET.

JAS. E. RODGERS CO., PRINTERS.

## CONTENTS OF JANUARY NUMBER.

ARTICLE.	PAGE.
I. EDUCATION. . . . . By J. W. Nevin, D. D.	5
II. THE SACRAMENTAL ENERGIES OF THE CHURCH, THE HIGHER MIRACLES OF GRACE. . . . . By Rev. P. S. Davis, A. M., Chambersburg, Pa.	20
III. THE PERICOPES, OR SELECTIONS OF GOSPELS AND EPISTLES FOR THE CHURCH YEAR.—No. 3 . . . . . By Rev. E. E. Higbee, D. D.	44
IV. FREDERICK SCHLEIERMACHER. . . . . By Alex. Harris, Lancaster, Pa.	69
V. THE WESTERN LITURGY. . . . .	92
VI. THE PRIESTLY ELEMENT IN THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY. . . . . By Rev. George Lewis Staley, Petersburg, Md.	114
VII. THE INFANCY OF CHRIST. . . . .	138
VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. . . . .	157

# OUR STORE.

---

WE take great pleasure in making the announcement to our friends, in this public way, that, in the Book Store established by the Synod's Board of Publication, may, at all times, be found a large and well selected stock of

**HYMN BOOKS,**

**CATECHISMS,**

**LITURGIES,**

**QUESTION BOOKS,**

**SUNDAY SCHOOL REQUISITES,**

and a full line of

## SUNDAY SCHOOL BOOKS

of the latest publications, from the different publishing houses in this city, New York, and Boston.

Also, our own books:

**THREE CHRISTMAS EVES,**

**TRUE GLORY OF WOMAN,**

**THE FUTURE LIFE, 3 Vols.**

**LIFE OF SCHLATTER,**

**VOICE OF BLOOD,**

**GOLDEN CENSER,**

**INFANT SALVATION,**

**UNION WITH THE CHURCH,**

**CREED AND CUSTOMS,**

**SINAI AND ZION,**

**HARBAUGH'S HARFE,**

**LEO REMBRANDT,**

**OLD SCHOOL MASTER,**

**YOUTH IN EARNEST,**

**FATHER MILLER,**

**LIFE OF CAIN,**

**ROGATIAN,**

**EASTER EGGS,**

**MONICA,**

**GOOD FRIDAY,**

**SALOME THE DANCER.**

Any of the above books sent by mail, postpaid, upon the receipt of the retail price.

Any other book published sent upon the same condition.

Please send us your orders, and we guarantee satisfaction.

Address all your orders to

**"REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,"**

**54 North Sixth Street,**

**PHILADELPHIA, PA.**

## THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The "MERCERSBURG REVIEW" was commenced in January 1849. In 1853 its name was changed to "MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY." In 1857 the old name was restored, and under that title it was issued up to the close of 1861, when its publication was suspended.

After its suspension a growing desire for its re-issue was repeatedly expressed from various directions. It was felt that the earnest questions it so vigorously discussed in former years, were neither fully settled nor out of the way, and new allied issues also continued to press upon the Church from all sides. The specific work of the REVIEW was not yet done. Hence, resuming the old title, its re-issue commenced in January, 1867, with the purpose that, as far as possible, it shall in character, life, and spirit, be a continuation of the old MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The design of the REVIEW is the development of Christological, Historical, and Positive Theology; and to labor in the sphere of general science and literature only so far as these are necessarily related to, and must be moulded by the science of sciences. Its pattern is the venerable Apostles' Creed. With the Creed the REVIEW regards Jesus Christ as the Central Revealer of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity, the true and ultimate principle of all revelation; the new Head and Life of Humanity restored in His Person, and to be glorified in Him by the Holy Ghost; the central principle of Christianity, and the fundamental basis of the Church, which is His Body. Hence, it holds all Theology to be primarily Christological; and, because Christological, also Historical; and, because both these, truly Positive.

On the same ground, and for the same reason, the REVIEW will be Catholic, claiming a title to the Theological treasures of all ages.

The REVIEW appreciates at the same time the historical, theological, and practical necessity of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and is, therefore, Protestant. It proposes, also, to make due account of the revival and advancement of theology during the last quarter of a century in Protestant Germany, the depth and wealth of which deserves the honor and gratitude of entire Christendom, as having effected a decisive victory over the boldest and profoundest forms of unbelief.

With these more general interests in view, the REVIEW will not fail to give due attention to the more special department of Reformed Theology, both in its historical aspect, as reaching back to the Reformation, and in its present status as being still, as all living theology ever must be, in a process of development under the type peculiar, especially to the German branch of the Reformed Church of this country.

The REVIEW will, moreover, steadily hold forth the fact, that the Theology by which the German branch of the Reformed Church of America, in its latest tendencies, is apprehended and carried forward, is not based on mere abstract speculation, but rather on the primal facts and the everlasting verities of Christianity; and it will aim at unfolding the deeply solemn practical character and tendencies of this type of theology.

Finally, whilst this REVIEW proposes to abate nothing of what is due to the scientific and classic form properly belonging to a Theological Review, it will endeavor, as far possible, to meet and satisfy the needs of an intelligent, earnest, and inquiring laity.

The REVIEW is edited by the Rev. T. G. Apple, D. D., President of Mercersburg College, Mercersburg, Pa., assisted by other eminent writers of the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly; in the months of January, April, July, and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 160 pages.

### TERMS.

For one year's subscription, THREE DOLLARS paid in advance.

For two year's subscription, FIVE DOLLARS paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers accompanied with \$18.

POSTAGE.—The postage is three cents per number, or twelve cents per year to any part of the United States.

The numbers will be sent as first ordered, until explicit directions are received for discontinuance or change of address. Missing numbers will be supplied only when notice is given within the quarter for which the number is missing, but not to those who change their residence without giving notice of the change PREVIOUS to the appointed time of publication, viz: the first of January, April, July, and October.

Orders for the REVIEW, with remittances, are to be sent direct to the publishers,

### REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

51 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notice, and manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, as well as all letters relating to the editorial department, must be directed to the Editor, at Mercersburg, Pa.

*W. Gerhart*

VOL. V.

NEW SERIES.

NO. 2.

THE  
**Mercersburg Review;**

AN ORGAN FOR

CHRISTOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL AND POSITIVE THEOLOGY.

EDITED BY  
**T. G. APPLE, D.D.,**

PRESIDENT OF MERCERSBURG COLLEGE, MERCERSBURG, PA.

Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia  
in semet ipsum recapitulans.—IRENÆUS.

VOLUME XVIII.

APRIL, 1871.

PHILADELPHIA:  
REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,  
54 NORTH SIXTH STREET.

JAS. B. RODGERS CO., PRINTERS.



## CONTENTS OF APRIL NUMBER.

ARTICLE.	PAGE.
I. SCHLEIERMACHER, AND THE THEOLOGY OF THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW. . . . .	165
By Rev. Wm. M. Reily, A. M., Jonestown, Pa.	
II. THE AMERICAN COLLEGE ON THE DEFENSIVE. . . . .	182
By Lewis H. Steiner, Frederick city, Md.	
III. THE VINE AND THE HUSBANDMAN. . . . .	196
By Rev. Walter E. Krebs, A. M., Irwin, Pa.	
IV. THE CREED AND DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. . . . .	207
By Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Mercersburg, Pa.	
V. REBEKAH. . . . .	229
By R. Leighton Gerhart.	
VI. HEAVEN VIEWED UNDER A LOCAL ASPECT. . . . .	232
By Rev. F. A. Gast, A. M., Lancaster, Pa.	
VII. THE PILOT. . . . .	260
By R. Leighton Gerhart.	
VIII. THE FORTY DAYS AFTER THE RESURRECTION. . . . .	262
By Rev. John M. Titzel, A. M., Emmitsburg, Md.	
IX. THE PERICOPES, OR SELECTIONS OF GOSPELS AND EPISTLES FOR THE CHURCH YEAR.—No. 4. . . . .	278
By Rev. E. E. Higbee, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa.	
X. THE BOOK OF JONAH. . . . .	303
By Rev. J. B. Kerschner, Mercersburg, Pa.	
XI. RECENT PUBLICATIONS. . . . .	321

# PUR STORE.

---

WE take great pleasure in making the announcement to our friends, in this public way, that, in the Book Store established by the Synod's Board of Publication, may, at all times, be found a large and well selected stock of

**HYMN BOOKS,  
CATECHISMS,  
LITURGIES,  
QUESTION BOOKS,  
SUNDAY SCHOOL REQUISITES,**

and a full line of

## **SUNDAY SCHOOL BOOKS**

of the latest publications, from the different publishing houses in this city, New York, and Boston.

Also, our own books:

**THREE CHRISTMAS EVES,  
TRUE GLORY OF WOMAN,  
THE FUTURE LIFE, 3 Vols.**

**LIFE OF SCHLATTER,  
VOICE OF BLOOD,**

**GOLDEN CENSER,**

**INFANT SALVATION,**

**UNION WITH THE CHURCH,**

**CREED AND CUSTOMS,**

**SINAI AND ZION,**

**HARBAUGH'S HARFE,**

**LEO REMBRANDT,**

**OLD SCHOOL MASTER,**

**YOUTH IN EARNEST,**

**FATHER MILLER,**

**LIFE OF CAIN,**

**ROGATIAN,**

**EASTER EGGS,**

**MONICA,**

**GOOD FRIDAY,**

**SALOME THE DANCER.**

Any of the above books sent by mail, postpaid, upon the receipt of the retail price.

Any other book published sent upon the same condition.

Please send us your orders, and we guarantee satisfaction.

Address all your orders to

**"REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,"**

**54 North Sixth Street,**

**PHILADELPHIA, PA.**

## THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The "MERCERSBURG REVIEW" was commenced in January 1849. In 1853 its name was changed to "MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY." In 1857 the old name was restored, and under that title it was issued up to the close of 1861, when its publication was suspended.

After its suspension a growing desire for its re-issue was repeatedly expressed from various directions. It was felt that the earnest questions it so vigorously discussed in former years, were neither fully settled nor out of the way, and new allied issues also continued to press upon the Church from all sides. The specific work of the REVIEW was not yet done. Hence, resuming the old title, its re-issue commenced in January, 1867, with the purpose that, as far as possible, it shall in character, life, and spirit, be a continuation of the old MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The design of the REVIEW is the development of Christological, Historical, and Positive Theology; and to labor in the sphere of general science and literature only so far as these are necessarily related to, and must be moulded by the science of sciences. Its pattern is the venerable Apostles' Creed. With the Creed the REVIEW regards Jesus Christ as the Central Revealer of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity, the true and ultimate principle of all revelation; the new Head and Life of Humanity restored in His Person, and to be glorified in Him by the Holy Ghost; the central principle of Christianity, and the fundamental basis of the Church, which is His Body. Hence, it holds all Theology to be primarily Christological; and, because Christological, also Historical; and, because both these, truly Positive.

On the same ground, and for the same reason, the REVIEW will be Catholic, claiming a title to the Theological treasures of all ages.

The REVIEW appreciates at the same time the historical, theological, and practical necessity of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and is, therefore, Protestant. It proposes, also, to make due account of the revival and advancement of theology during the last quarter of a century in Protestant Germany, the depth and wealth of which deserves the honor and gratitude of entire Christendom, as having effected a decisive victory over the boldest and profoundest forms of unbelief.

With these more general interests in view, the REVIEW will not fail to give due attention to the more special department of Reformed Theology, both in its historical aspect, as reaching back to the Reformation, and in its present status as being still, as all living theology ever must be, in a process of development under the type peculiar, especially to the German branch of the Reformed Church of this country.

The REVIEW will, moreover, steadily hold forth the fact, that the Theology by which the German branch of the Reformed Church of America, in its latest tendencies, is apprehended and carried forward, is not based on mere abstract speculation, but rather on the primal facts and the everlasting verities of Christianity; and it will aim at unfolding the deeply solemn practical character and tendencies of this type of theology.

Finally, whilst this REVIEW proposes to abate nothing of what is due to the scientific and classic form properly belonging to a Theological Review, it will endeavor, as far possible, to meet and satisfy the needs of an intelligent, earnest, and inquiring laity.

The REVIEW is edited by the Rev. T. G. Apple, D. D., President of Mercersburg College, Mercersburg, Pa., assisted by other eminent writers of the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly; in the months of January, April, July, and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 160 pages.

### TERMS.

For one year's subscription, THREE DOLLARS paid in advance.

For two year's subscription, FIVE DOLLARS paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers accompanied with \$18.

POSTAGE.—The postage is three cents per number, or twelve cents per year to any part of the United States.

The numbers will be sent as first ordered, until explicit directions are received for discontinuance or change of address. Missing numbers will be supplied only when notice is given within the quarter for which the number is missing, but not to those who change their residence without giving notice of the change previous to the appointed time of publication, viz: the first of January, April, July, and October.

Orders for the REVIEW, with remittances, are to be sent direct to the publishers,

### REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

54 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notice, and manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, as well as all letters relating to the editorial department, must be directed to the Editor, at Mercersburg, Pa.

VOL. V.

NEW SERIES.

NO. 3.

THE  
**Mercersburg Review;**

AN ORGAN FOR

CHRISTOLOGICAL, HISTORICAL AND POSITIVE THEOLOGY.

EDITED BY  
**T. G. APPLE, D.D.,**  
PRESIDENT OF MERCERSBURG COLLEGE, MERCERSBURG, PA.

*Unus Christus Jesus dominus noster, veniens per universam dispositionem, et omnia  
in semet ipsum recapitulans.—IRENEUS.*

VOLUME XVIII.

JULY, 1871.

PHILADELPHIA:  
REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD.  
54 NORTH SIXTH STREET.

JAS. B. RODGERS CO., PRINTERS.

## CONTENTS OF JULY NUMBER.

---

### ARTICLE.

I. THE REVELATION OF GOD IN CHRIST.	325
By Rev. J. W. Nevin, D.D.	
II. THE FOURFOLD CULTURE OF MAN.	343
By Rev. C. Z. Weiser, A.M., Pennsburg, Pa.	
III. ST. PAUL THE CORYPHEUS OF EVANGELICAL PROGRESS.	373
By Rev. I. E. Gracff, Tamaqua, Pa.	
IV. RESTORATION AND CONVERSION OF THE JEWS.	386
By Rev. J. S. Foulk, A.M., Carlisle, Pa.	
V. SCRIPTURE VIEW OF HOLY BAPTISM.	405
By Rev. D. Y. Heisler, Mt. Alto, Pa.	
VI. GLORY AND HONOR.	438
By Rev. M. Kieffer, D.D., Greencastle, Pa.	
VII. THE MIRACLE OF PENTECOST IN RELATION TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.	457
By Rev. Wm. Rupp, A.M.	
VIII. RECENT PUBLICATIONS.	483

**REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD.**

**OUR STORE.**

**NEW BOOKS.**

The Reformed Church Publication Board have just published several New Books, for the Sunday School Library, viz:

ROGATIAN,	75cts.	EASTER EGGS,	50cts
YOUTH IN EARNEST,	90cts.	LIFE OF CAIN,	75cts.
THE RIPE HARVEST,	50cts.	GOOD FRIDAY,	40cts.
FATHER MILLER,	75cts.	CREED AND CUSTOMS,	\$2.00.
SALOME, THE DANCER,	40cts.	SINAI AND ZION,	\$2.00
CHRISTIAN HOLYDAY STORIES, 50cts.			
TRUE GLORY OF WOMEN, \$1.25.			

THE OLD SCHOOLMASTER, 90cts.

GOSPEL LESSONS, Arranged according  
to the Church Year, 50cts.

LEO REMBRANDT, 90cts.

HARBAUGH'S HARFE, \$1.50.

Any of which will be sent, postpaid, to any address, on receipt of the retail price.

Send on your orders, and address—

THE REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,  
54 North 6th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

---

**Harbaugh's Harfe.**

---

**THE POPULAR POEMS**

WRITTEN BY THE LATE DR. HARBAUGH IN

**PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN,**

Edited by REV. B. BAUSMAN, and Illustrated with six fine Engravings of Dr. Harbaugh's early home, the "Alt Schul Haus an der Krick," etc., has just been issued by the Reformed Church Publication Board in a beautiful octavo volume, at \$1.50, sent by mail at the above price. Address:

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD, Philadelphia.

## THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The "MERCERSBURG REVIEW" was commenced in January 1849. In 1853 its name was changed to "MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY." In 1857 the old name was restored, and under that title it was issued up to the close of 1861, when its publication was suspended.

After its suspension a growing desire for its re-issue was repeatedly expressed from various directions. It was felt that the earnest questions it so vigorously discussed in former years, were neither fully settled nor out of the way, and new allied issues also continued to press upon the Church from all sides. The specific work of the REVIEW was not yet done. Hence, resuming the old title, its re-issue commenced in January, 1867, with the purpose that, as far as possible, it shall in character, life, and spirit, be a continuation of the old MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The design of the REVIEW is the development of Christological, Historical, and Positive Theology; and to labor in the sphere of general science and literature only so far as these are necessarily related to, and must be moulded by the science of sciences. Its pattern is the venerable Apostles' Creed. With the Creed the REVIEW regards Jesus Christ as the Central Revealer of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity, the true and ultimate principle of all revelation; the new Head and Life of Humanity restored in His Person, and to be glorified in Him by the Holy Ghost; the central principle of Christianity, and the fundamental basis of the Church, which is His Body. Hence, it holds all Theology to be primarily Christological; and, because Christological, also Historical; and, because both these, truly Positive.

On the same ground, and for the same reason, the REVIEW will be Catholic, claiming a title to the Theological treasures of all ages.

The REVIEW appreciates at the same time the historical, theological, and practical necessity of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and is, therefore, Protestant. It proposes, also, to make due account of the revival and advancement of theology during the last quarter of a century in Protestant Germany, the depth and wealth of which deserves the honor and gratitude of entire Christendom, as having effected a decisive victory over the boldest and profoundest forms of unbelief.

With these more general interests in view, the REVIEW will not fail to give due attention to the more special department of Reformed Theology, both in its historical aspect, as reaching back to the Reformation, and in its present status as being still, as all living theology ever must be, in a process of development under the type peculiar, especially to the German branch of the Reformed Church of this country.

The REVIEW will, moreover, steadily hold forth the fact, that the Theology by which the German branch of the Reformed Church of America, in its latest tendencies, is apprehended and carried forward, is not based on mere abstract speculation, but rather on the primal facts and the everlasting verities of Christianity; and it will aim at unfolding the deeply solemn practical character and tendencies of this type of theology.

Finally, whilst this REVIEW proposes to abate nothing of what is due to the scientific and classic form properly belonging to a Theological Review, it will endeavor, as far possible, to meet and satisfy the needs of an intelligent, earnest, and inquiring laity.

The REVIEW is edited by the Rev. T. G. Apple, D. D., President of Mercersburg College, Mercersburg, Pa., assisted by other eminent writers of the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly; in the months of January, April, July, and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 160 pages.

### TERMS.

For one year's subscription, THREE DOLLARS paid in advance.

For two year's subscription, FIVE DOLLARS paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers accompanied with \$18.

POSTAGE.—The postage is three cents per number, or twelve cents per year to any part of the United States.

The numbers will be sent as first ordered, until explicit directions are received for discontinuance or change of address. Missing numbers will be supplied only when notice is given within the quarter for which the number is missing, but not to those who change their residence without giving notice of the change PREVIOUS to the appointed time of publication, viz: the first of January, April, July, and October.

Orders for the REVIEW, with remittances, are to be sent direct to the publishers,

### REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

54 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notice, and manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, as well as all letters relating to the editorial department, must be directed to the Editor, at Mercersburg, Pa.





N

ref

Edi  
bau  
the  
mai

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD.

**OUR STORE.**

NEW BOOKS.

The Reformed Church Publication Board have just published several New Books, for the Sunday School Library, viz:

ROGATION,	75cts.	EASTER EGGS,	50cts
YOUTH IN EARNEST,	90cts.	LIFE OF CAIN,	75cts.
THE RIPE HARVEST,	50cts.	GOOD FRIDAY,	40cts.
FATHER MILLER,	75cts.	CREED AND CUSTOMS,	\$2.00.
SALOME, THE DANCER,	40cts.	SINAI AND ZION,	\$2.00.
CHRISTIAN HOLYDAY STORIES, 50cts.			

TRUE GLORY OF WOMEN, \$1.25.


THE OLD SCHOOLMASTER, 90cts.

GOSPEL LESSONS, Arranged according  
to the Church Year, 50cts.

LEO REMBRANDT, 90cts.

HARBAUGH'S HARFE, \$1.50.

Any of which will be sent, postpaid, to any address, on receipt of the retail price.

 Send on your orders, and address—

THE REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,  
54 North 6th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

---

**Harbaugh's Harfe.**

---

**THE POPULAR POEMS**

WRITTEN BY THE LATE DR. HARBAUGH IN

**PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN,**

Edited by REV. B. BAUSMAN, and Illustrated with six fine Engravings of Dr. Harbaugh's early home, the "Alt Schul Haus an der Krick," etc., has just been issued by the Reformed Church Publication Board in a beautiful octavo volume, at \$1.50, sent by mail at the above price. Address:

REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD, Philadelphia.

## THE MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The "MERCERSBURG REVIEW" was commenced in January 1849. In 1853 its name was changed to "MERCERSBURG QUARTERLY." In 1857 the old name was restored, and under that title it was issued up to the close of 1861, when its publication was suspended.

After its suspension a growing desire for its re-issue was repeatedly expressed from various directions. It was felt that the earnest questions it so vigorously discussed in former years, were neither fully settled nor out of the way, and new allied issues also continued to press upon the Church from all sides. The specific work of the REVIEW was not yet done. Hence, resuming the old title, its re-issue commenced in January, 1867, with the purpose that, as far as possible, it shall in character, life, and spirit, be a continuation of the old MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

The design of the REVIEW is the development of Christological, Historical, and Positive Theology; and to labor in the sphere of general science and literature only so far as these are necessarily related to, and must be moulded by the science of sciences. Its pattern is the venerable Apostles' Creed. With the Creed the REVIEW regards Jesus Christ as the Central Revealer of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity, the true and ultimate principle of all revelation; the new Head and Life of Humanity restored in His Person, and to be glorified in Him by the Holy Ghost; the central principle of Christianity, and the fundamental basis of the Church, which is His Body. Hence, it holds all Theology to be primarily Christological; and, because Christological, also Historical; and, because both these, truly Positive.

On the same ground, and for the same reason, the REVIEW will be Catholic, claiming a title to the Theological treasures of all ages.

The REVIEW appreciates at the same time the historical, theological, and practical necessity of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and is, therefore, Protestant. It proposes, also, to make due account of the revival and advancement of theology during the last quarter of a century in Protestant Germany, the depth and wealth of which deserves the honor and gratitude of entire Christendom, as having effected a decisive victory over the boldest and profoundest forms of unbelief.

With these more general interests in view, the REVIEW will not fail to give due attention to the more special department of Reformed Theology, both in its historical aspect, as reaching back to the Reformation, and in its present status as being still, as all living theology ever must be, in a process of development under the type peculiar, especially to the German branch of the Reformed Church of this country.

The REVIEW will, moreover, steadily hold forth the fact, that the Theology by which the German branch of the Reformed Church of America, in its latest tendencies, is apprehended and carried forward, is not based on mere abstract speculation, but rather on the primal facts and the everlasting verities of Christianity; and it will aim at unfolding the deeply solemn practical character and tendencies of this type of theology.

Finally, whilst this REVIEW proposes to abate nothing of what is due to the scientific and classic form properly belonging to a Theological Review, it will endeavor, as far possible, to meet and satisfy the needs of an intelligent, earnest, and inquiring laity.

The REVIEW is edited by the Rev. T. G. Apple, D. D., President of Mercersburg College, Mercersburg, Pa., assisted by other eminent writers of the Reformed and other Churches. It is published quarterly; in the months of January, April, July, and October of each year. Each number will contain an average of 160 pages.

### TERMS.

For one year's subscription, THREE DOLLARS paid in advance.

For two year's subscription, FIVE DOLLARS paid in advance.

A free copy will be sent to any one who sends us the names of six new subscribers accompanied with \$18.

POSTAGE.—The postage is three cents per number, or twelve cents per year to any part of the United States.

The numbers will be sent as first ordered, until explicit directions are received for discontinuance or change of address. Missing numbers will be supplied only when notice is given within the quarter for which the number is missing, but not to those who change their residence without giving notice of the change previous to the appointed time of publication, viz: the first of January, April, July, and October.

Orders for the REVIEW, with remittances, are to be sent direct to the publishers,

### REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,

54 North Sixth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NOTICE.—The Exchanges of the REVIEW, books for notice, and manuscripts intended for the REVIEW, as well as all letters relating to the editorial department, must be directed to the Editor, at Mercersburg, Pa.

e  
 f  
 e  
 r  
 e  
 f  
 a  
 s  
 o  
 r  
 a  
 e  
 f  
 .  
 d  
 e